National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

NL-339 (r. 88/04) c

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

SEX ROLE ORIENTATIONS AND PERCEIVED PARENTING EFFECTIVENESS

BY

TRACY COOK

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND

RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FUFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY STUDIES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1990

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-65044-3

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Tracy Cook

TITLE OF THESIS: Sex Role Orientations and Perceived Parenting Effectiveness

DEGREE: Master of Science

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1990

PERMISSION IS HEREBY GRANTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY TO REPRODUCE SINCGLE COPIES OF THIS THESIS AND TO LEND OR SELL SUCH COPIES FOR PRIVATE, SCHOLARLY OR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH PURPOSES ONLY.

THE AUTHOR RESERVES OTHER PUBLICATION RIGHTS, AND NEITHER THE THESIS NOR EXTENSIVE EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT THE AUTHOR'S WRITTEN PERMISSION.

Tracy Cook

(Student's Signature)

[redacted]

(Student's Permanent Address)

[redacted]

[redacted]

Date: [redacted]

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

THE UNDERSIGNED CERTIFY THAT THEY HAVE READ, AND RECOMMEND TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH FOR ACCEPTANCE, A THESIS

ENTITLED SEX ROLE ORIENTATIONS AND PERCEIVED PARENTING EFFECTIVENESS

SUBMITTED BY TRACY COOK

IN PARTIAL FUFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF: MASTER OF SCIENCE

Brenda Munro

BRENDA MUNRO

JANET FAST

MAURICE BLACKMAN

DATE: APRIL 26, 1990

DEDICATION

To my husband and friend Garth Cook,
my sons Trent and Garrett,
my parents Royce and Marge Mattice,
for their confidence, support
and encouragement.

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a study of the relationship between sex role orientation, gender, and perceptions of effective parenting. Specifically it is a look at whether individuals with different sex role orientations and gender perceive their parenting abilities differently. It involves the main and interaction effects of gender, Bem Sex Role Inventory categories, and efficacy ratings.

Findings are compared to and interpreted utilizing three seperate models; Traditional Congruency Model, Androgyny Model, and Masculinity Model. The study addresses threory testing in regards to hypotheses generated from each of the models.

A questionnair and the Bem Sex Role Inventory were used to collect the date on 70 intact families. A secondary analysis of data was employed. One way analysis of variance was used to determine the influence of gender, which was found not to be significant, and two-way analysis of variance determined main and interaction effects of sex role orientation on perceptions. A Scheffe analysis determined differences between groups. Results indicate that there is a significant difference between undifferentiated and feminine subjects.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

There are a number of people whom the author wishes to thank. First, I wish to thank Dr. Brenda Munro, the supervisor of this thesis, for her guidance, wisdom, encouragement, humor, patience, and stamina. The time and support she gave so freely is deeply appreciated and will never be forgotten.

Second, the author is grateful to the members of her committee, Dr. Maurice Blackman and Dr. Janet Fast, for their academic imput and quidance. Their advice, time, encouragement, and constant support during this project was greatly appreciated. To Dr. Blackman a special thank you for the encouragement and belief you had when directing me to pursue my masters and the aid and support you gave me while achieving it. The special role you have played in my life will never be forgotten.

Third, to members of the Department and my fellow students, I thank you for your friendship, support, and caring. You inspired me to continue when my confidence and dedication was faultering.

Finally, a special thanks to my family and friends. To my husband Garth, who exemplifies effective parenting, I thank you for constantly providing me with the courage to attempt, the support to keep trying, and the reason to succeed. I love you.

To my sons Trent and Garrett, who so patiently waited in

their cribs for "mommy to finish just one more page," now we have time for perceptions of efficacy becoming reality despite my sex role orientation.

To my parents who have always supported me and believed in me. I thank you for making this dream a reality and for being just the way you are.

To my friends who are always there for me in bad times and in good. The support and confidence they shared was very needed and very appreciated. The understand the true meaning of friend. I love you all and thank you beyond words.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

A. INTRODUCTION.....1
Conceptual Definitions.....6

CHAPTER II

A. LITERATURE REVIEW.....9
Introduction.....9
Perceived Self Efficacy.....10
Perceived Self Efficacy In Parenting...13
Traditional Congruency Model.....21
Androgyny Model.....28
Masculinity Model.....38

CHAPTER III

A. RESEARCH DESIGN.....47
Introduction.....47
Sample.....47
Data Collection Method.....50
Dependent Variable.....50
Independent Variables.....55
Data Analysis.....58

CHAPTER IV

A. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....59
Two Way Analysis of Variance.....59

CHAPTER V

A. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.....63
Answers to Research Questions.....64
Limitations.....72
Recommendations For Future Research....74

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....77

APPENDIX A.....83

APPENDIX B.....87

APPENDIX C.....106

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. Factor Analysis.....53

TABLE 2. Reliability Analysis.....54

TABLE 3. Means and Standard Deviations.....54

TABLE 4. Two-Way Anova Means and Cells Summary.....61

TABLE 5. Two-Way Anova Summary Table.....61

TABLE 6. One-Way Anova (Scheffe).....62

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to examine perceived parental effectiveness as it relates to sex role orientation and gender. The specific variables to be examined in this study, in relation to perceived efficacy, are sex role orientation and gender. Sex role orientation denotes the degree to which a person possesses masculine and feminine traits. This variable has been chosen as it has been credited with influencing psychological adjustment, self esteem, and behaviors. Perceptions have also been credited with influencing these variables (Heilbrun, 1976) and yet somehow the relationship between sex role orientations and perceptions have never been tested. It appears logical and necessary to test these two variables as they appear to be linked. The fact that perceptions are believed to influence variables such as behaviors indicates that sex role orientation researchers need to understand the role that perceptions play if they are to truly understand the behavioral findings that exist from previous research.

The primary focus to date in the area of sex role orientations has been on the relationship between one's orientation and noted behaviors. For instance, Bem (1974) stated that persons of differing sex role orientations behave differently in complex situations, such as the parenting situation.

Baumrind (1982) found that one's behaviors can vary with one's sex role orientation but did not investigate whether one's perceptions could also vary. Therefore, it would appear appropriate that one examine the relationship that sex role orientations and gender may have with regards to perceived efficacy in parenting in order to better understand Baumrind's behavioral findings.

The massive amount of research that has been carried out in the area of sex role orientation has resulted in discrepant findings. The discrepancies also exist in the models which guide the research in this area. There are three models in this area and all of them differ with regards to how sex role orientations affect individuals and which sex role orientations are most effective for individuals. The relationship between perception and sex role orientations will be analyzed with respects to the three models which did emerged from the literature in the early 70's and still today guide research dealing with sex role orientations. Briefly stated, the traditional congruency model states that overall well being and functioning is fostered when one's sex role orientation is congruent with one's gender. The androgyny model proposes that possessing both masculine and feminine traits will maximize well being. The masculinity model suggests that well being is a function of the extent to which one possesses masculine traits. (Whitley, 1985).

These three models have been examined, although often in

isolation of each other, utilizing numerous variables, such as flexibility, self esteem, adaptability, power and control, parenting skills and styles, and overall psychological well being (Bem, 1974, 1979; Baumrind, 1982; Jackson et al., 1986; Kelly & Worell, 1977; Lobel & Winch, 1986; Orlofsky & O'Heron, 1987; Schwarz & Clive, 1987; Windle, 1986). Despite such a wide variety of literature, no research has examined how sex role orientation relates to perceptions of efficacy in the parenting role. Rather, the researchers have concentrated on actual behaviors and the measurements of psychological concepts such as self esteem. The three models will be compared in this study in order to provide insight with regard to which model most accurately depicts the relationship between sex role orientations and perceived efficacy in parenting. The gender of the subjects is implicitly important within some of the models and disregarded in others; however, the gender of the subjects will be considered with regard to those models which incorporate this variable.

The purpose of this study is to examine this relationship, and, since it is concerned only with the perceptions of the individuals, no claims will be made as to the actual parenting behaviors that may or may not occur in subjects carrying out their daily parenting roles. Such inquiries, although worthy of consideration, will be left for future research endeavours. Subsequently, the research questions are: 1. Is perceived efficacy in parenting related to the sex role

orientation of the individual parent?

2. How does gender relate to perceptions of efficacy in parenting.

3. Which model of sex role orientation most accurately reflects the relationship between perceived parental efficacy and sex role orientation?

The area of parenting effectiveness was one of the reasons family studies was developed and today is still a topic of interest in the field. To date researchers have focused on observed parenting behaviors (eg. Baumrind, 1982; Bugen & Humenick, 1983; Jackson et al., 1986; Rotundo, 1985). Although such research provides knowledge of how parents behave and carry out their parenting role, it provides little insight into how parents perceive their parenting effectiveness.

This researcher wishes to examine perceptions of parental efficacy, rather than actual parenting effectiveness for numerous reasons. First, the desire to examine perception is based on an assumption put forth by Larson et al. (1973) who claim that perception is an important dimension of family reality and that it has been neglected in family theory and research to date (Larson et al.; 1973). This researcher concurs with such an assumption. Second, this researcher strongly agrees with Safilios-Rothschild's belief that a person's perceived reality affects his behaviors and the style and quality of his interpersonal relationships (Safilios-Rothschild, 1970). Based on such an assumption, it appears

necessary to understand the role of perception in family members if we are to fully understand the behaviors of individuals and their interpersonal relationships within the family. Larson et al. (1973) stress the importance of this by claiming that the connection between perception and behaviors whether in the laboratory or in the family remains largely unexplored. It therefore appears necessary to examine peoples perceptions first if we are to be able to understand how and why people behave the way they do. This research will endeavor to explore this presently unexplored area.

A final reason for studying perception in family members, and the variables that influence it, is that such study may offer insight into behaviors that may prove advantageous for marriage and family practitioners, as well other professionals dealing with families (Larson et al.; 1973). Prior work in the application of family therapy has revealed that understanding perceptions may allow one to discriminate between distressed and nondistressed marriages and families (Laing et al.; 1966). Examining the first step, that being perceptions, and the variables that influence those perceptions, will enable all family studies scholars to better understand families and the individual members in their entirety.

This study deals with a large number of concepts encountered both in the literature and the models. Due to the unfamiliar nature of these terms to many readers it may be beneficial to examine their conceptual meanings prior to

encountering them in the literature.

Conceptual Definitions

Masculinity is conceived of as a sociocultural orientation that incorporates socially desirable characteristics for males such as appropriate assertiveness, instrumentality, task directedness, cognitive orientations, and social ascendence (Kelly & Worell, 1977). Simply stated, masculinity is a term that denotes the traditional characteristics society has attempted to foster in males.

Femininity is conceived of as a sociocultural orientation that exemplifies the socially desirable characteristics of females such as supportiveness, expressiveness, affectivity, and concern for others (Kelly & Worell, 1977). In simple terms, it refers to the characteristics society has traditionally attempted to foster in the female gender.

Androgyny denotes the presence of both masculine and feminine traits within an individual (Kelly & Worell, 1977). That is to say, a person possesses a mixture of those traditional characteristics fostered in both males and females.

Undifferentiated is reserved to denote those individuals who reveal little integration of either masculine or feminine traits (Kelly & Worell, 1977). These people exhibit low degrees of the traditional characteristics fostered in males and females, and are conceived of as being less attuned to the traditional cultural definitions (Pyke & Graham, 1983).

Sex typed individuals assimilate either the masculine or

feminine set of traits which is congruent with their biological gender (Kelly & Worell, 1977). These individuals therefore will be masculine if they are male and feminine if they are female.

Cross sex typed individuals assimilate either a masculine or feminine set of traits which are incongruent with their biological gender (Pyke & Graham, 1983). This is to say, masculine female and a feminine male would both be categorized as cross sex typed individuals by theorists and researchers.

Gender is one term which causes mild confusion within the area of research under consideration (Pyke & Graham, 1983). The reason for this confusion is that the term has been used to denote both psychological gender and biological gender. Despite this confusion the overall consensus between the theorists and researchers is that the term denotes the biological sex of an individual at birth (Kelly & Worell, 1977). This is how the present research will use the term. It is essential to note that the importance of gender is implicit in some models and not in others, as evident by terms such as sex typed appearing and being of concern within certain conceptual models, such as the traditional model.

Self Perception has been defined by Vander Zanden (1981: 488) as "the process by which we come to know and think about ourselves- the characteristics, qualities, and inner states that we attribute to ourselves." This research will utilize this definition when referring to self perception.

Self Efficacy has been used by Gecas & Schwalbe (1986) to refer to the sense of one's competence or effectiveness in dealing with the social and physical environments. Furthermore, they suggest that self efficacy is a component of one's self esteem, although it remains conceptually distinct (Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986).

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

Behaviors versus Perceptions

Past researchers in the area of sex role orientation have concentrated on behavioral outcomes (Baumrind, 1982) and psychological gains (Ross, 1977; Bem, 1978) associated with the individuals' sex role orientation category (ie. masculine, feminine, etc.). Such factors as the level of one's self esteem, depression, competency, sociability, flexibility, parenting effectiveness, to name only a few areas, have been measured as related to types of sex role orientations.

Despite the widespread attention focusing on sex role orientations there exists a paucity of research on the relationship of ones sex role orientation to ones perceptions of efficacy. Rather researchers have been more behavioral in nature. There appears to be a underlying assumption that behaviors and perceptions are inseparable. As it is easier to measure and change behaviors the focus in much of the literature has been on changing behaviors. However it may be argued that perceptions precede behaviors. For example, Hergenhan (1982) states that perceptions of efficacy directly influence behaviors and hence psychological well being. If this is the case it would appear that the first step in understanding human behaviors is to understand the perceptions guiding

behaviors. This is an area that has been neglected in past research.

Shortcomings within the Theories

Theorists have also neglected the importance of perception. Many models of sex role orientation have emerged, each with different assumptions about how sex role orientations influence our lives, adjustments, and behaviors, however the role of perceptions as related to behaviors is again neglected. The results of the emergence of these theoretical models has been the advocating of one or more models without the consideration of how perceptions are a part of the model. The development of these models have implementations affecting society in the form of skill training programs, educational programs, and socialization techniques. This could prove problematic if the assumptions underlying the models are inaccurate.

The following review will examine the literature on perceptions, both in general and with regards to parenting effectiveness, sex role orientation models and the research that has been conducted on this topic. The review will also identify weaknesses in the past theory and research.

PERCEIVED SELF EFFICACY

Researchers have recently begun to examine the relationship between perceived self efficacy and achievement behavior.

Self efficacy refers to personal judgments of one's capability to organize and implement behaviors in specific situations (Schunk, 1984). Therefore if perceptions of self efficacy are related to increases in achievement it is important to begin to examine the role that perceived self efficacy plays in parenting if our goal is to be able to aid parents in successfully performing their parenting role. Hergenhahn (1982) found that persons with high perceived self efficacy try more, accomplish more, and persist longer at tasks than those who maintain low perceived self efficacy. Based on this finding he would suggest that increasing parenting skills begins with increasing perceptions of efficacy.

Bandura (1977) claims that people with high perceived self efficacy have more control over events in their lives and subsequently are often times more successful in their endeavors. Bandura further states the assumption that if a person's perceived self efficacy becomes more realistic, behavior will become more adaptive (Bandura, 1977). This finding suggest that we need to understand both actual behaviors and personal perceptions of those behaviors. Quite evidently this calls for the need to examine the relationship between perceptions and behaviors. Parenting has only been scrutinized by behavioral standards it appears necessary to expose the relationship that exists between these behaviors and the perceptions that may be guiding them. Only then can we truly begin to consider ways of improving parenting ability.

Perception Of Efficacy and Its Relationship to Behavior

Bandura, Adams, and Beyer (1977) tested the assumption that perceived self efficacy relates directly to behavior by studying snake phobics. Each subject was given a behavior avoidance test and then were randomly assigned to two treatment groups: participating model conditions, where the subjects actually held the snakes, modeling conditions, where the subjects observed a model handling the snakes, and the control group. Following the various treatments, subjects were again given the behavior avoidance test in order to measure efficacy expectations. Following this, subjects were to hold a live boa constrictor. Results indicated that efficacy expectations were accurate predictors of behavior. Those subjects who indicated that they could hold a snake actually did so. Bandura felt that such findings could aid in a vast number of areas. Parenting could indeed be just such an area, for if we are able to understand peoples' self efficacy, we can find ways to aid them in increasing their perceptions of their abilities and subsequently increase their optimal functioning in the parenting role. Bandura (1984) supports such an assumption since his studies revealed that individuals who regard themselves as highly efficacious act, think and feel differently from those who perceive themselves to be inefficient. He further attests that self perceptions of efficacy contribute significantly to performance accomplishment (Bandura, 1984).

Locke et al. (1984) also found that perceived self efficacy was a significant predictor of future performance. They had subjects complete task strategies under high, low and controlled conditions. They then administered self efficacy scales after each trial. Their findings revealed that self efficacy was strongly related to past performance and was a significant predictor of future performance (Locke et al., 1984). Therefore, if past performance plays a role in future performance, training perspective parents for their parenting role may help aid them in having a more positive perception of self efficacy. This may result in increased ability in actual parenting and the study draws attention to the present need to examine the importance of perceptions and subsequently the variables that affect our perceptions.

PERCEIVED SELF EFFICACY IN PARENTING

Variables Affecting Perceptions of Efficacy

The parents' perceptions of parenting competence is an neglected area in past research. The emphasis has been placed on examining the children's perceptions, the teachers' perceptions, and professionals' perceptions of parenting capability. Recently, a few researchers have attempted to assess the efficacy ratings of the parents themselves (Colten, 1982; Wright, Matlock & Matlock, 1985). Many variables have been found to be associated with perceived parenting

effectiveness, such as parental drug addiction, special needs children, and gender of the parent. Sex role orientation of the parents is one variable that has not been examined. Based on past research it may be suggested that perceptions are influenced by factors in our lives and subsequently influence our parenting ability (Colten, 1982; Jaworowska, 1981). If based on past literature the hypothesis that sex role orientations affect parenting ability (Baumrind, 1982) and perceptions affect parenting effectiveness, the logical linkage would be between sex role orientations and perceptions.

The research to date on the variables that affect perceptions of parental effectiveness are few. The focus of past studies has been on predictors of perceptions. Colten (1982), for example, found that heroin-addicted mothers expressed more doubt in their adequacy as mothers and ability to influence and control their children than did non-addicted mothers. Wright, Matlock & Matlock (1985) found similar feelings of inadequacy and negative emotions with regard to parenthood in their study on parents of handicapped children. Jaworowska (1981) explored the gender perception differences and found that mothers visualized themselves as being warm, giving parents more often than their children, while subsequently visualizing their spouses as being more cold. Jaworowska did not question his subjects as to whether such perceived warmth made them effective in their parenting role.

It is important to note that Jaworowska examined gender and not sex role orientations.It is conceivable that the sex role orientation of his subjects maybe the influencing variable as opposed to gender. This limitation is noted in much of the research and the present study will address both the variable of gender and sex role orientation in order to fairly assess the impact of each variable.

Perceptions of Efficacy and Improving Parenting

Other researchers have examined the relationship between positive perceptions of efficacy and improved abilities within the parenting role (Schinke et al., 1986). If a linkage does exist between perceptions and behaviors then it would be reasonable to explore ways of increasing perceptions in order to improve parenting behaviors. The authors of these studies obviously believe that perception does play an important role in parenting. The work of these authors supports the basic premise of the present study.

However it should be noted that much of the past research has been carried out with special populations. Schinke et al. (1986) looked at adolescent mothers' perceived efficacy before and after their involvement in a behaviorally oriented coping skill intervention program. Within this study significant gains in perceived parental ability, child care self-efficacy and elevated measures of psychological well being were found (Schinke et al., 1986).

Social support programs have also been utilized in aiding perceptions of efficacy. Cutrona & Troutman (1986) examined parental depression and found that social support is related to a lower depression and higher self efficacy rating for postpartum depressed mothers.

Perceptions of Efficacy: Life Stages and Gender Differences

Recent researchers have begun to examine perceived efficacy throughout the stages of the parenting experience. Ballenski & Cook (1982) surveyed a group of mothers on their perceived competency in five stages of parenting: infancy, toddlerhood, preschool, school age and adolescence. Their overall findings revealed that the subjects reported feeling highly competent in most areas of parenting with each stage presenting new and unique challenges. Despite such perceived competence the mothers also revealed that they felt least effective in the adolescent stage and revealed feeling uncomfortable with their parenting capabilities. However the Ballenski & Cook's study (1982) is an evaluation of the maternal perspective only, as they did not survey the fathers' perceptions of efficacy, nor did they take into account the orientations of their subjects.

The apparent neglect of the fathers' perceptions is evident in studies other than just Ballenski & Cook's (1982). As recently as 1987, there appears to be an emphasis placed on the maternal perspective in the research. This negates both the possible role of ones orientation as well as ones gender.

Claims of these studies are questionable if one believes that all influencing variables have not been given equal consideration.

Hoch (1987) studied the relationship between adult children who became parents and their elderly parents, while subsequently examining the adult children's perceptions of their own parenting efficacy. Here, the sample included 19 female parents and 1 male parent. Although her study revealed that almost all of her sample rated themselves as quite good at parenting, the deficiency of male subjects, and the smallness of the overall sample prevents generalizing of findings to the overall perceptions of parenting.

Kazak & Linney (1983) also sampled only mothers in their study on single parents efficacy, stress, and life satisfaction. Their subjects completed the Perceived Role Competency Scale, and the findings revealed that parenting was the role of greatest perceived competency (Kazak & Linney, 1983). Their sample was very restricted, due to the single parent qualifier; the findings thus reveal no information about the efficacy of male parents in the single-family situation. Such a study may provide differing results leading to the greater understanding of perceived efficacy in parenting. Furthermore an evaluation of the sex-role orientations of the parent of either gender could provide an even greater understanding of the variables that play a role in perceived parental efficacy. The present study will address

this shortcoming as it will consider both variables.

Another study that exemplifies this shortcoming was carried out by Knaub, Eversoll, and Voss (1983). They surveyed the attitudes of 213 female Family and Women's Studies students who at the time were not parents. Their findings revealed that the subjects had confused perceptions of the effects of parenthood on the male gender and that, although all the females intended to parent, they assessed their preparation to do so as limited (Knaub, Eversoll, & Voss, 1983). This study brings into question the changing nature of perceived efficacy and the variables that may accompany such changes. As well it calls forth a need to equally examine gender and sex role orientation at different stages in the parenting cycle.

Roberts (1983) attempted to study parenting phenomenon from the perspective of both genders. She examined the relationship between amount of obligatory infant behavior, (ie. that being behaviors parents must perform for the survival of the child), and parents' perceptions of the transition to parenthood. She found that fathers experience less normative change and made an easier transition to parenthood than did mothers, despite the fact that the mothers perceived themselves to be more competent in the parenting role. Such a finding reveals that efficacy may mean different things to the different genders, and may involve different variables rather than simply adjustment. Examining the sex role orientations in

conjunction with the gender of the parents may enable researchers to uncover one such possible variable that influences both perceptions and subsequent adjustment to life changes.

Tomlinson (1987) assessed married couples to determine how sex role attitudes, perceived father involvement, and marital equity affected the transition to parenthood. Her findings revealed that the mothers' perceptions were positively influenced by nontraditional sex role attitudes and greater father involvement, suggesting that their perceptions of parenting and their possible perceptions of their effectiveness may be altered by having a nontraditional support system within their marriage. Interestingly, the fathers' perceptions were positively influenced by marital equity and more negatively influenced by inequity than the mothers' perceptions (Tomlinson, 1987). Such a study lends support for the need to further examine how sex role attitudes may affect the parental perceptions of self efficacy, as well as a means of aiding in the improvement of present day and future parents' perceptions.

Difficulties with Research on Perceptions of Parenting

The research on perceptions of efficacy and the influence it has on parenting is fraught with difficulties. First, sex role orientations have basically been ignored as a variable that may influence perceptions of efficacy. This is concerning

considering that literature exists linking perceptions to parenting ability, and sex role orientation to parenting skills. Researchers have simply neglected to examine the interactional relationship that may exist between the variables of sex role orientations and perceptions of efficacy in parenting. If we don't understand this relationship it would appear futile to comment on the behavioral component of parenting.

Secondly, when sex role orientation has been examined it is often times in isolation of gender despite the claim of some theorists who believe that the two are interrelated. If we are to understand this field sex role orientation and gender should be examined jointly or independently to determine the influencing relationship when considering people perceiving themselves as parents.

The factors affecting perceptions have been neglected to a great extent by previous researchers. Despite this neglect programs utilizing the premise that perceptions can change behaviors, have been instituted. Further research is needed in this area.

Theories Governing the Research

This study was designed to address, in part, some of these problems. It will utilize both gender and sex role orientation in an effort to gain further insight into what influence they have on perceptions of efficacy in the

parenting role. It is hoped that this in turn may aid professionals in understanding the variables that play a role in some of the behaviors noted with regards to parenting, and subsequent means of improving them.

The desire to aid professionals and lay people is partly focused on the need for clarity. This field and the variables in it are presented differently depending upon which theory one backs. Unlike some areas of research this field is governed by three competing theories, all of which differ in terms of the assumptions generated, thus reducing clarity of understanding. Theories are necessary but when they differ in their hypothesis to the extend that the theories in this field differ it causes one to question the validity of all the theories. If we are to aid professionals and lay people it is not just desired but necessary to examine the theories in this field and put them to scientific scrutiny. The following is a discussion of the three theories which incorporates the literature to date on the theories as well as the hypotheses on perceptions of parenting generated by the theory.

TRADITIONAL CONGRUENCY MODEL

Until the late 1960's, gender was primarily treated as a dichotomous variable accounting for the psychological

differences between the sexes (Baumrind, 1982). Traditional gender identity theorists (e.g., Bacon & Child, 1957; Benedek, 1956; Blos, 1962; Klein, 1948; Parsons, 1951; Ross, 1977) posited that, in order to be competent, clear gender role distinctions should be maintained. These theorists claim that due to a biological predisposition and reinforced appropriate socialization, men and women are competent in different areas, and they argue for keeping the roles distinct rather than muting them (Baumrind, 1982).

This thinking is based on Freudian premises, taking a developmental perspective on what is "appropriate" gender behavior (Baumrind, 1982). The traditionalists, following this Freudian and neo-Freudian assumption, claim that well-defined, gender-related traits are characteristics of the well-adjusted person (Baumrind, 1982). The traditionalists assume that, for psychological well being and competency in all areas, including perception of efficacy in parenting, one must have predominantly a masculine or feminine sex role orientation, and this orientation must be congruent with one's gender (e.g., Kagan, 1964; Mussen, 1969). Broverman et al. (1970) found support for these traditionalists' claim: they found that female subjects were judged as maladjusted or "sick" when they exhibited gender incongruent behavior.

Traditional Theory versus Androgyny Theory

Traditional theorists assume that sex-typed individuals will be psychologically healthy and competent individuals. This is not to say that traditional theorists disqualify androgynous individuals as well adjusted. Traditionalists view androgynous individuals as those who demonstrate high degrees of both masculine and feminine traits and, therefore, have a high degree of sex appropriate characteristics (Baumrind, 1982). However, these theorists would say that sex typed individuals should rate higher in perceived efficacy, than the androgynous individuals, because their traits are in line with societal stereotypes (Baumrind, 1982).

The distinction between the traditionalists and the androgynous theorists comes in the traditionalists' argument for the adequacy of the sex-typed individual. The traditionalists further attest that undifferentiated individuals, those possessing low degrees of both masculine and feminine traits,are similar to cross sexed individuals,in that they both lack sex appropriate characteristics resulting in a lack of psychological health and competency. (Baumrind, 1982)

Traditional Theory and Parenting

Studies supporting traditionalists' claims about superiority of sex typed individuals and parenting are limited. Baumrind (1982) conducted a large study designed to

analyze the androgyny theory and the premise that androgynes of both sexes were more effective people and parents, as well as more authoritative in their parenting style. This study utilized an extensive number of methods for data collection, including self-report tests, naturalistic and structured observations, numerous standard tests, as well as intensive interview sessions. Her main objective was to examine behavioral consequences associated with sex role orientations. Her findings failed to support the androgyny theory. Her findings revealed that sex typed mothers were responsive and sex typed fathers were firm, which supports traditional theory with regard to gender appropriate sex roles in parenting. She further found that androgynous parents were likely to be child-centered rather than authoritative and, contrary to androgyny theory, they did not produce more competent children. In fact, there was a slight indication that sex typed parents produced somewhat more competent children than did androgynous parents (Baumrind, 1982).

Although this study controlled for a number of variables Baumrind did not examine perceptions of the parents. Unlike the perception studies she did consider both sex role orientation and gender but negated to address if and how perceptions could be influencing her behavioral findings. It is possible that all her sex typed parents had positive self efficacy perceptions and subsequently had increased parenting skills. This is important to consider if the findings are to

be utilized in future training programs designed to increase parenting ability. It is imperative to understand all the variables and how sex role orientation, gender, and perceptions are related before advocating for one model above the others. This is not to say that traditional theory is incorrect or that Baumrind's findings are inaccurate, rather it calls attention to the forgotten variable of perception that needs to be considered when analyzing any and all of the theories.

Bugen & Humenick (1983) further found support for the traditional theory with respect to parenting. They examined parent-infant interaction in 37 couples. Their findings revealed that, although femininity was sufficient in accounting for the
variance noted in parent-infant interaction, gender was seen to play a significant role, with the least feminine females' interaction more than the most feminine males'. This finding would appear to lend support to the traditionalists' premise of gender and role congruency, if one perceives parenting to be viewed traditionally as primarily a female role.

The obvious criticism again points to the lack of attention given to perceptions of the subjects. These perceptions may relate to behaviors being noted in the findings. Parenting traditionally has been viewed as a female role. If perceptions could be altered, as we are finding with changing societal views, one may find that these results would

be altered also.

Bugen and Humenick did not address the perceptions of their subjects and if sex role orientation and gender do influence perceptions possibly this variable could account for the variance noted. It is not sufficient to claim that the sex typing alone is the reason for the findings as perceptions maybe interrelated with the sex typed individuals behaviors.

Traditional Hypotheses

Sex role orientation and gender maybe the link to how and why people perceive parenting differently however if we aspire to aiding parents in both their perceptions and their actions we need to examine this possible connection more carefully. The present study will examine this connection for all three models. With regards to the traditional model the predictions would be that the sex typed individuals should rate themselves to be effective parents, and furthermore they should exceed the ratings of the other categories. This hypothesis is based on the literature that states that these individuals have a higher degree of day to day functioning than individuals of other orientations. Furthermore the traditional theorists would assume that the androgynous individuals would rate second highest, followed by the cross sex typed subjects, and the undifferentiated. The cross sex typed individuals will rate higher than the undifferentiated, since they are perceived to have a confused sex role identity, as opposed to

no sex role identity at all, which is deemed extremely detrimental by traditional theorists.

The following hypotheses capture the essence of what traditional congruency theorists would predict with regard to perceived self efficacy ratings, as documented in the literature.

HYPOTHESES BASED ON THE TRADITIONAL CONGRUENCY MODEL

1. Those individuals who are feminine females will rate the highest in perceived efficacy,because parenting is viewed primarily as a female role from a societal perspective. These individuals will be categorized on the BSRI as sex typed females.

2. Those individuals who are masculine males will rate second highest on perceived parental efficacy, due to their optimal level of well being and their roles being consistent with societal stereotypes. These individuals will be categorized on the BSRI as sex typed males.

3. Those individuals who are masculine females will rate third highest on perceived parental efficacy, because they possess the higher appropriate assertiveness and instrumentality that may increase their perceptions of their effectiveness, as well as being female, which is viewed as the most appropriate gender for carrying out the parenting role

from a stereotypical societal perspective. These individuals would be categorized as cross sex typed females on the BSRI.

4. Those individuals categorized as feminine males will rate fourth highest on perceived efficacy in parenting, due to their assimilation of the feminine traits traditionally viewed as necessary in parenting. They will rate lower than the cross sex typed females because their gender is viewed as traditionally less attuned with the parenting role. These individuals will be classified as cross sex typed males on the BSRI.

5. The undifferentiated individuals will rate as the least effective in their perceptions of parenting because they are conceived as being less attuned to the cultural definitions of what is appropriate. Such a lack of integration with societal norms is traditionally viewed negatively by traditional theorists.

ANDROGYNY MODEL

In the early 1970's, researchers began to question the dichotomous nature of sex roles. Their investigations led to the development of the androgyny model (Bem, 1974,1979; Spence & Helmreich, 1979). The idea behind this model was that a person could be both masculine and feminine, depending upon

the requirements of the particular situation at hand. This idea brought into question the traditionally held belief that masculinity and femininity were two ends of the same continuum (Richardson, 1981). The androgyny model posits that masculinity and femininity are separate dimensions, independent and complementary to each other, both being available to men and women (Richardson, 1981; Whitley, 1985).

Bem Sex Role Inventory

The technique of assessing the sex role orientation of individuals was developed in the early 1970's by a device coined the Bem Sex Role Inventory. This instrument is a 60 item self-report, pencil - paper test designed to categorize individuals according to their degree of assimilation of the masculine and feminine traits (Bem, 1974). The instrument consists of three scales: one femininity scale, one masculinity scale, and one scale consisting of neutral items utilized in determining social desirability.

The scales taken together consist of 60 personality characteristics. The respondents indicate the degree to which each characteristic describes themselves using a seven-point rating code ranging from "never" to "almost never true", to "always" and "almost always true".

Based on the responses, the person receives two major scores; a masculinity score: a femininity score, with mean scores being given for each. Individuals who score above the

combined sex-median on the masculinity scale and below the median on the femininity scale are categorized as masculine in their orientation. Individuals scoring below the median on the masculinity scale and above the median on the femininity scale are categorized as having feminine typed orientations. Those individuals who score above the median on both the masculinity and the femininity scales are categorized as androgynous, and those scoring below the median on both scales are categorized as undifferentiated.

Original tests analyzing the extent to which the BSRI correlates with other measures were found to be moderate at best. During the second administration of the BSRI, subjects also filled out the masculinity and the femininity scales of the California Psychological Inventory and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (Bem, 1974). Both these instruments have been utilized in sex role research. The findings revealed that the BSRI did not correlate with the Guilford-Zimmerman scale and revealed moderate correlations with the CPI (Bem, 1974).

In summary, the BSRI was found to be both reliable and valid, and subsequently was utilized to measure the sex role orientation of the subjects in this sample.

Androgyny Model Assumptions

The androgyny model questions the traditional congruency assumption that regards people as consistent types. Androgyny

theorists maintain that individuals are capable of responding appropriately to varying demands and situations, thereby disputing the consistency and congruency assumption put forth by the traditionalists (Richardson, 1981).

The androgyny theorists (Bem, 1974; Spence & Helmriech, 1979) further dispute the traditionalists' assumption that sex typing is good for the individual and society (Richardson, 1981). Bem (1972), the leading advocate of the androgyny model, claims that not only does sex typing not enhance the development of people, but that it maybe even harmful to their competent functioning in daily life. Bem (1974) and other androgyny theorists (Spence & Helmreich, 1979) propose that psychological well being and overall competence is maximized when one has an androgynous sex role orientation due to the large repertoire of responses that are available for them to utilize in daily life situations.

Similarly, these theorists posit that androgynous individuals are superior in all areas as a result of their greater personal and social effectiveness due in part to their higher self esteem (Baumrind, 1982). Androgyny theorists agree with the traditionalists about the competency, self esteem, and overall psychological well being of undifferentiated individuals. They, like the traditionalists, argue that, unlike sex-typed individuals, the undifferentiated have diffuse identities and will subsequently lack both competency and self esteem resulting in a lower level of psychological

well being (Baumrind, 1982). Despite the theorists' acceptance of sex-typed, individuals maintaining a moderate degree of competency and psychological health, the expectation for these individuals is less than that predicted for androgynous individuals (Baumrind, 1982).

Studies on Flexibility, Adaptability, and Psychological Wellness

These assumptions have been supported by a number of studies to date. With regard to their claims of increased flexibility, adaptability, and overall psychological well being, Bem (1974) initiated the investigation utilizing studies designed to test how well androgynous people would do in sex role stereotyped behaviors, in comparison with other sex role classifications. The test designs ranged from inducing conformity to evoking stereotypical feminine behavior and cross sex typed behaviors (Bem, 1974; Bem et al., 1976; Bem & Lenney, 1976.). The findings from the studies showed significant support for the claims that androgynous individuals were more flexible, adaptable, and overall more content with the situation than were their sex typed counterparts, who were found to conform more easily and to be less flexible when asked to participate in cross sex typed behaviors. The studies concluded that not only did sex typed individuals prefer to engage in sex-appropriate behaviors, even when it paid less than sex inappropriate behaviors, but

also that they experienced psychological discomfort and negative feelings about themselves when forced to do cross sex typed behaviors (Bem & Lenney, 1976).

These studies are examining behaviors but the reference to discomfort appears to be addressing the underlying perceptions of the subjects. Despite this the perception variable was not tested even though it maybe influencing the findings. The androgynous subjects may have a high perception of their performance and this could account for the favorable behaviors and feelings noted by the researchers.

Androgyny; Self Concept, Adjustment, and Self Efficacy

More recently, investigators (e.g., Kalin & Lloyd, 1985; Murstein & Williams, 1983; Murstein & Williams, 1985) have examined the androgynous theorists' claims of better psychological adjustment as it relates to marital adjustment. All three studies found significant evidence that androgynous partners, especially the husbands, were positively related to better marital adjustment than those found in marriages consisting of partners with other sex role classifications.

One has to ask, Could it be possible that these androgynous subjects perceived their marriages more favorably and therefore worked harder at maintaining a happy union? This question points to the deficiencies noted in much of this research.

Studies supporting the premise that androgynous individuals will have higher self concepts and subsequently higher levels of perceived efficacy are found within the literature. Flaherty and Dusek (1980) utilized a multi-dimensional self-concept scale to test just such a premise. Their findings revealed that the androgynous group of subjects scored higher than the undifferentiated group on adjustment. The androgynous and the masculine groups scored higher than the feminine and undifferentiated groups on achievement and leadership. The androgynous and feminine groups scored higher on congeniality/sociability than did the masculine group. The findings imply that the relationship of masculinity and femininity to aspects of self concept depends upon the aspect of self concept being measured. Overall, however, the androgynous individuals scored high on all aspects of self concept, whereas the undifferentiated scored low on all aspects (Flaherty & Dusek, 1980). These findings lend support to the androgyny theorists' hypothesis of well being in terms of high self concepts for the androgynous typed person.

High self concept could be translated into perceptions of efficacy and if these findings are accurate one could hypothesize that sex role orientations and perceptions are related, however this hypothesis has not been addressed by the studies to date.

Campbell et al. (1981) utilized three self-report

indicators to assess competency amongst the sex role classifications. Their findings revealed that androgynous individuals were more skilful, less anxious, and more socially active than individuals categorized in any other sex role type. Further to this, the sex typed individuals obtained scores indicating more social competence than those obtained by the undifferentiated types, as the androgyny theory hypothesizes. Such findings would appear to lend support to the theory's predictions of higher efficacy in parenting, for if androgynous individuals maintain higher self concepts and are more skilful, less anxious, and more socially active it would seem plausible that they would also perceive themselves to be effective in their parenting role.

The studies addressing this concern are limited however it is necessary to examine the differences that could occur in a role that is traditionally viewed as either masculine or feminine in order to qualify the differences.

Androgyny and Parenting

Only two studies appear to involve parenting and sex role orientations.Ganong & Coleman (1987) examined familial love and concluded that androgynous subjects were more aware and expressive of love feelings and subsequently experienced more loving family relationships than sex stereotyped or undifferentiated subjects. Such a finding may play a role in predicting perceptions of higher efficacy in androgynous

subjects, since it could be assumed that their familial experience would be perceived positively as opposed to subjects with other sex role classifications.

Rotundo (1985) examined fatherhood and concluded that the androgynous father is more active in the details of day-to-day child care and is both more expressive and intimate than fathers with other sex role classifications. Such a finding could be assumed to relate to androgynous fathers perceiving themselves to be effective in their parenting role to a greater extent than those fathers who are less involved and have differing sex role orientations. If this is the case increased efficacy may be aided by advocating for socializing our children towards androgynous classifications in order to increase their subsequent parenting ability.

Findings such as these appear to lend support to the androgynous theory's assumption that androgynous individuals will perceive themselves to be more effective parents than those who have differing sex role orientations. The present study will consider how sex role orientations and gender are related to ones perceptions of the traditionally viewed female role of parenting in order to test this assumption.

Androgyny Theory Hypotheses

The theorists who support this model believe that androgynous individuals will be capable of carrying out a task successfully despite the perceived sex role stereotypes that

may accompany that task (Bem, 1974). Therefore such theorists would predict that the androgynous individual should rate themselves as more effective than the other classifications. They further predict that sex typed individuals will rate second in perceived effectiveness, cross sex typed individuals third, and the undifferentiated will rate themselves as ineffective, compared with the other classifications (Baumrind, 1982).

The following hypotheses state the assumed predictions of the androgynous theorists based on the literature to date.

HYPOTHESES BASED ON THE ANDROGYNY MODEL

1. Individuals categorized as androgynous will rate highest on perceived parental efficacy because they possess enhanced abilities to function in all facets of life.

2. Those individuals categorized as sex typed, despite gender, will rate second highest because they possess traits which are appropriate in terms of societal stereotypes.

3. Those individuals who are classified as cross sex typed, despite gender, will rate third in perceived parental efficacy because they do not possess those traits that are appropriately conceived of by their gender.

4. Those individuals who are classified as undifferentiated will rate as the least effective in perceived parenting ability, because they lack assimilation of the traits commonly found in either of the sexes.

MASCULINITY MODEL

Researching the disagreements between the traditional congruency model and the androgyny model brought forth data that was unexplained by the assumptions of both models, and subsequently the empirically based model of masculinity was born. Researchers began to get empirical findings that suggested that the masculine component of androgyny was primarily responsible for the competency and psychological well being ratings that were found in the subjects of research (e.g., Antill & Cunningham, 1979; Locksley & Colten, 1979; Silvern & Ryan, 1979; Whitley, 1983). This led them to predict that high degrees of masculinity resulted in psychological well being, incorporating both competency and self esteem (Baumrind, 1982).

Therefore, proponents of the masculine model not only dispute the validity of the androgyny construct, but also claim that sex-typing is disadvantageous for women because feminine identification is stigmatized to a greater extent than masculine identification (Baumrind, 1982).

Masculinity and Self Esteem

To date, studies appear to be finding evidence to support the assumptions put forth by such theorists. The evidence stems from studies on self esteem (e.g., Bem, 1977; Cate & Sugawara, 1986; Kelley & Worell, 1977; Spence et al., 1975; Whitley, 1983) and psychological health and adjustment (Adams & Sherer, 1985; Anderson, 1986; Bassoff & Glass, 1982; Orlofsky & O'Heron, 1987; Pyke, 1985; Whitley, 1985).

The role of the masculine component in self esteem was first questioned by the findings of a study done by Spence et al. (1975), which indicated that androgynous and masculine typed subjects, regardless of gender, reported significantly higher levels of self esteem than did the feminine typed subjects of both sexes. Questioning such findings, Bem (1977) carried out her own study on self esteem and found that indeed the masculine typed subjects reported as high, and sometimes higher, levels of self esteem despite gender.

One has to wonder whether our society's approval of individuals possessing masculine traits has resulted in those individuals having higher perceptions of themselves and their abilities. Further to this these perceptions and abilities need to be considered in terms of the roles carried out by different orientations and the societies 'views' of the different roles. To date this has not been scientifically scrutinized rather higher self esteems have been credited as

influential across all roles.

Kelley & Worell (1977) have attempted to address the issue of the societal value placed on different traits but negated to question the values in terms of the roles being performed. They claim that such findings may indicate the higher social value attributed to masculine characteristics, which leads to a higher self evaluation for those who are masculine types. Their analysis called for further investigation of the need for a better understanding of the role self esteem plays in sex role orientations and the masculine model.

Whitley (1983) took up the call to further investigate the influence of one's roles by completing a meta-analysis of 35 studies of the relation between sex role orientation and self esteem. The results of the analysis revealed the strongest support for the masculine model. His findings further revealed that the strength of the relationship varied as a function of both the sex role measure and the type of self esteem measure used in the studies.

Cate & Sugawara (1986) put forth a study designed to test the various dimensions of self esteem utilizing high school students. Their results provided strong support for the masculine model, especially in the female gender. However it is important to note that advanced education may still be perceived as a male dominated area subsequently masculine traits may influence perceptions of self esteem in this area

as well.

Masculinity Theory And Psychological Well Being

Self esteem has been utilized as the primary indicator of psychological well being in a number of sex role studies (Whitley, 1983). The focus on psychological well being stems from the claims made by advocates of all the models. Therefore it is understandable that the majority of research put forth to test the models utilizes variables concerned with psychological health and adjustment. The studies done to test the masculinity model are no exception. Bassoff & Glass (1982) conducted a meta analysis of 26 studies from 1961 - 1980 that related mental health and sex role orientations. Their findings confirm a strong association between having a masculine orientation and superior mental health.

Whitley (1985) conducted another meta analysis designed to test the accuracy of the three models. He analyzed 32 studies relating sex role orientation and depression and general adjustment. Similar to Bassoff & Glass (1982), Whitley found that masculinity had a moderately strong relationship to both high adjustment and lack of depression, whereas femininity had only a small relationship to adjustment and no relationship to depression.

With regard to general adjustment, self esteem and self acceptance, Long (1986) investigated the role of masculinity in a sample of female professionals, victims of domestic

violence, and college students. Her findings revealed that masculinity was the best predictor of self esteem in all groups, and the best predictor of self acceptance in all groups except the professionals, femininity was generally irrelevant (Long, 1986).

If the masculinity model is accurate in assuming that those with masculine orientations will have higher self esteem and psychological adjustment ratings than those of other categories, then it is presumable that these subjects should also have higher ratings of perceived self efficacy. Adams & Sherer (1985) examined the relationship of psychological adjustment and sex role orientations by utilizing measures of self efficacy, assertiveness, and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. They found not only strong support for the masculinity model, but their factor analysis also suggested that masculinity is related to assertiveness and self efficacy rather than to the absence of maladjustment (Adams & Sherer, 1985).

Masculinity Theory Hypotheses

If the literature reviewed and this model's assumptions are correct,then masculinity should be related positively to competency, self esteem, and psychological well being, all of which are presumed to play a role in perceived parenting effectiveness.

It is assumed therefore that a masculine orientation will best prepare individuals for optimal functioning and psychological well being within their lives (Orlofsky & O'Heron, 1987; Whitley, 1985). Based on this model, the prediction could be put forth that all individuals classified as masculine, despite their gender, should rate themselves higher in self efficacy ratings than any of the other sex role orientations. One could further predict that the androgynous individuals will rate higher than those who are classified as feminine due to the presence of the masculine trait in the androgynous individual. As was predicted with regard to the other two theories, the undifferentiated individuals should have lower self efficacy ratings than any of the other classifications since they have limited integration of masculine traits and are thought to lack the integration of societal norms. Those rated as feminine do not lack an integration of societal norms and therefore would be predicted to fare better than the undifferentiated subjects (Baumrind, 1982). The following hypotheses summarize the predictions put forth by proponents of the masculine model.

HYPOTHESES BASED ON THE MASCULINITY MODEL

1. Those individuals who are classified as masculine, despite gender, will rate highest on perceived efficacy due to masculine theorists' assumption that optimal well being is

primarily a function of the masculine, instrumental traits.

2. Those individuals who are classified as androgynous, despite gender, will rate second highest on perceived parental efficacy, because they possess high degrees of the masculine trait.

3. Those individuals who are classified as feminine males will rate third on the perceived efficacy rating due to their lack of assimilation of the masculine traits. They will however rate higher than feminine females due to their biological gender is
less stigmatized than the female gender from a societal perspective.

4. Those individuals who are categorized as feminine females will rate forth in terms of perceived efficacy, because they possess low degrees of the masculine trait and their feminine identification is stigmatized by society.

5. Those individuals who are classified as undifferentiated will rate the lowest on perceived efficacy, because they possess low degrees of either the masculine or the feminine traits which society deems necessary for optimal well being.

Literature and Theoretical Integration

In summary, the literature reviewed indicates that examining perceptions in relationship to gender and sex role orientations is important. If research is to continue with regards to behavioral studies it appears necessary to examine variables that affect behaviors, perceptions being one of those variables. With respect to the theoretical literature cited all the models have received some support and the inconsistency of the findings reported leaves one with ambivalence in terms of how gender and sex role orientations may affect our perceptions of parental efficacy. Possibly the models are not as distinct from each other as the theorists would lead us to believe. If this is the case its important to examine the possible overlap that may exist rather than advocating for one model over the others. This study will examine whether or not the different models accurately explain one type of perception, in order to clarify whether it is appropriate to advocate for one specific model or whether a blending of the models' assumptions would be more appropriate with regards to future research and application of the findings. The present study will address many of the short comings noted in the previous reviewed projects. Those being examined are:

1. The role being studied may influence the findings therefore it is very important that research specifies the

role under consideration and restrain from making broad assumptions beyond the scope of the specific role under consideration. This will be accomplished by examining perceptions of only one role, that being the traditionally ascribed female role of parenting.

2. Perceptions of parenting efficacy as opposed to behaviors and/or ratings will be analyzed in order to assess whether or not perceptions vary with regards to gender and sex role orientations. This will be accomplished by not making any claims with regards to behaviors or perceptions in other roles.

3. Testing of all three models will be carried out as opposed to advocating for one model and isolating the others. This should eliminate the bias that maybe accounting for the inconsistencies noted in the literature reviewed.

4. Finally, this study will not simply assume that parenting is influenced by gender, sex role orientation and one's perceptions but rather its purpose is to examine the possible relationship that has been assumed to exist and analyze the findings within the conceptual models to date. Unlike other research the link will not be assumed and then negated rather it will be put to statistical analysis and then commented upon.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

This chapter focuses on a discussion of the research methods employed to address the research questions. This chapter will include a description of the sample selection and characteristics, the procedures and materials used in data collection, a discussion on the creation of the perceived efficacy scale, as well as the details of the statistical analysis and research design utilized in the present study.

Sample

The sample for this study was obtained by Adams (1983) and was a non-random purposive sample acquired from birth notices in a local newspaper. The families were all residents of the metropolitan Edmonton area and consisted of 70 mothers and 70 fathers (see Appendix C).

All couples were married 3 to 17 years, the mean number of years of marriage being 8.9. Respondents had a mean age of 32.7 for the fathers, with a range of 23 to 43 years. The mothers had a mean age of 30.8, with a range of 21 to 38 years.

Education levels indicated that f the fathers and 56% of the mothers had some college or professional training, with 13% of the fathers and 4% of the mothers having had graduate level training.

The percentage of fathers employed full time was 95%, and 4% of the mothers were employed full time. The percentage of mothers on maternity leave was 41%, and 13% were employed on a part-time basis.

Using Hollingshead's "Two Factor Index" (1957), social class ranged from upper class to lower class. The percentage of fathers classifying themselves as upper or upper-middle class was 24%, whereas 23% of the mothers classified themselves in these two categories. The percentage of fathers rating themselves as middle class was 29% and 39% of the mothers saw themselves in this class. In the lower-middle and lower-class categories, the fathers had a ranking of 47%, and 37% of the mothers rated in the lower-middle class, with no mothers rated in the lower-class category.

Gross income ranged from $10,000. to over $50,000. per year, with 46% of the fathers and 1.4% of the mothers earning over $35,000. Since 83% of the mothers were unemployed at the time of the study, 46% had no income whereas only 1.4% of the fathers had no income.

The sample consisted of individuals from all three major religions, with 51% of the fathers and 54% of the mothers being Protestant. Approximately one third of the sample was Catholic, 31% of the fathers and 34% of the mothers, whereas only 2% were Jewish. 14% of the fathers and 9% of the mothers reported "other" as their religious affiliation. Most of the sample did not attend church, with 75% of the fathers and 59%

of the mothers rarely or never attending.

Procedure

Letters explaining the study were sent out to all the names gathered from birth announcements in a local newspaper. These letters were then followed up by a phone call used to determine the following criteria of the study: the families were intact, with two children per family both conceived from the present marriage, the youngest being at least 6 months of age and the oldest being no more than up to the first grade. It was also pertinent that the families were not moving, in order to maintain subject contact. The criteria resulted in nearly 100% participation.

An initial pilot study was conducted on 30 families for the purpose of refining the questionnaire. This study utilized both the questionnaire and the interview procedure. Then 70 families were interviewed, bringing the sample size of individual parents to 140. These individual parents were interviewed from 1 to 2 hours, separate from any member of the family, and communication between spouses was discouraged until the interview process was complete. The anonymity of the individuals was preserved by assigning numbers to each participant. The subjects were then thanked and informed that, upon request, they would receive a copy of the results of Adams' (1983) study.

This study was reviewed by the Faculty of Home Economics'

Human Ethics Review Committee. Policy guidelines for ethical consideration as set out by the General Faculty Council of the University of Alberta were followed, and the study was subsequently approved.

Data Collection Method

The research in this study utilizes data collected from the responses Adams (1983) gathered from his questionnaire.

The study's internal validity was preserved as the scale was administered only once, decreasing the threats of history, maturation, testing effects, regression to the mean, experimental mortality, instrument error and selection maturation.

The external validity can be expected to be low, as the sample utilized was a non-random sample. Bias may result, since the study precludes the participation of parents who did not publish birth notices in the local newspaper. As well, the sample tends to be skewed towards urban middle-to upper-class participation as noted in the sample criteria review. Therefore, the findings may not be representative of lower-class and/or rural parents.

Dependent Variable:

Perceived Parenting Effectiveness. The dependent variable tested is that of perceived parenting effectiveness. The ratings of parental perceptions of efficacy were derived from a scale created by utilizing certain questions from Adams'

(1983) questionnaire.

Scale Creation:

The initial analysis conducted by this researcher was an attempt to create a scale of perceived parenting effectiveness by subjecting a number of possibly relevant questions from Adam's questionnaire to factor analysis. Factor analysis was utilized as this statistical procedure provides one with insight as to whether or not any of the eleven questions chosen were sharing a common construct, relating to perceptions of efficacy.

This statistical procedure was completed using the SPSSx program and the selection was based on a factor loading of .5 or better. Three of the eleven questions selected loaded above the cutoff point (Table 1). The three questions were: How close do you feel to this child? (.59563), Rate your effectiveness as a parent with the first child (.64090), and Do you feel you were prepared enough for the parenting experience with the first child? (.64675).

These three questions were then subjected to Cronbach's reliability test in order to assess the internal consistency of the items. The results indicated that indeed these three questions were related and the results repeatable indicated by an alpha = 0.5293 (Table 2).

The concurrent validity was then tested utilizing Pearson Product Moment Correlations. All three questions produced high correlations exceeding the p=.05 significance level and

obtaining a level of p=.000 (r= .7122, r= .8171, r= .6206). Thus suggesting that a linear relationship between the total and the items did indeed exist (Table 3).

PERCEIVED EFFICACY QUESTIONS & ABBREVIATIONS

Questions:

Q1. (Was first baby planned?)

Q2. (Was first baby free of serious defects?)

Q3. (Have you attended parenting courses?)

Q4. (How close do you feel to this child?)

Q5. (Rate your effectiveness as a parent.)

Q6. (Rank spouse's participation in child care.)

Q7. (Rate marital happiness after first birth.)

Q8. (Do you feel you were prepared enough for the parenting experience with the first child?)

Q9. (Were your parents better prepared for their first parenting experience compared to you?)

Q10. (Should first time parents be expected to take parenting courses?)

Q11. (Does first time parenting create closeness/distance to one's own spouse?)

TABLE 1

FACTOR ANALYSIS

Factor Matrix:

Question #	Factor 1
Q1.	-.46075
Q2.	-.33041
Q3.	.28132
Q4.	.59563*
Q5.	.64090*
Q6.	-.10472
Q7.	.31628
Q8.	.64675*
Q9.	.35013
Q10.	.46641
Q11.	.33452

* Indicates factors that load above .5

TABLE 2

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean If Item Deleted	Scale Variance If Item Deleted	Alpha If Item Deleted
4.	5.7883	.8593	.3710
5.	6.4891	.5752	.4124
8.	8.8029	1.0123	.4863

ALPHA = 0.5293

TABLE THREE

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

Variable	Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation
Total	137	10.5401	1.2188
Q4	139	4.7482	.5121
Q5	139	4.0360	.7558
Q8	137	1.7372	.4418

Q = Question Number

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

	Q4	Q5	Q8
Total	.7122 (137) p=.000	.8171 (137) p=.000	.6206 (137)

Independent variables:

Sex Role Orientation. One independent variable is sex role orientation of the parents. Sex role orientation is defined as a self classification of culturally approved behaviors characterized as either masculine or feminine as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1978).

Bem Sex Role Inventory. The sex role orientation of each subject was measured using the complete 60-item version of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1978). This instrument is a self-report, pencil-paper test designed to categorize individuals according to their degree of assimilation of the masculine and feminine traits (Bem, 1974). The instrument consists of three scales: one femininity scale, one masculinity scale, and one scale consisting of neutral items utilized in determining social desirability.

The scales taken together consist of 60 personality characteristics. The respondents indicate the degree to which each characteristic describes themselves using a seven-point rating code ranging from "never" to "almost never true", to "always" and "almost always true".

Based on the responses, the person receives two major scores; a masculinity score: a femininity score, with mean scores being given for each. Individuals who score above the combined sex-median on the masculinity scale and below the median on the femininity scale are categorized as masculine in their orientation. Individuals scoring below the median on the

masculinity scale and above the median on the femininity scale are categorized as having feminine typed orientations. Those individuals who score above the median on both the masculinity and the femininity scales are categorized as androgynous, and those scoring below the median on both scales are categorized as undifferentiated.

Internal consistency, as computed using coefficient alpha, is high, ranging from alpha = .86 for masculinity to alpha = .82 for femininity (Bem, 1978). The androgyny scores were computed by masculinity minus femininity, and alpha ranged from .85 to .86 (Bem, 1978).

The test - retest reliability method was utilized to determine the reliability of the BSRI. The test was administered for the second time four weeks following the first testing. Product-moment correlations were computed between the first and second administrations, and all four scores presented with high reliability; masculinity r=.90, femininity r=.93, androgyny r=.93, and social desirability r=.89, (Bem, 1974). Yanico concluded that the Bem Sex Role Inventory is as reliable as other written instruments used to measure sex role orientations.

Construct validity was high and was determined by one hundred judges categorizing two hundred personality characteristics as being masculine or feminine based on being "significantly more desirable for a men or for a women." Using two tailed t tests (Bem, 1974, p. 157), such judgments

indicate high face validity.

Bem (1977) utilizing Pearson product moment correla-tion found that the BSRI was uncorrelated with social desirability (r=-.06) (Bem, 1977).

Discriminant validity is high, as the masculine and feminine scores are empirically independent. Using Pearson r, r ranges from -.02 to .11 for males, and from -.07 to -.14 for females (Bem, 1974).

Original tests analyzing the extent to which the BSRI correlates with other measures were found to be moderate at best. During the second administration of the BSRI, sub-jects also filled out the masculinity and the femininity scales of the California Psychological Inventory and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (Bem, 1974). Both these instruments have been utilized in sex role research. The findings revealed that the BSRI did not correlate with the Guilford-Zimmerman scale and revealed moderate correlations with the CPI (Bem, 1974).

In summary, the BSRI was found to be both reliable and valid, and subsequently was utilized to measure the sex role orientation of the subjects in this sample.

Gender. The independent variable of gender is defined as a self classification of the subjects on Adam's questionnaire in which the subjects indicated whether they were of the male or female gender.

Data Analysis:

This study has analyzed secondary data which was collected by Adams (1983) to examine various topics relating to the two-child family.

To answer the research question, "How does sex role orientation relate to perceived efficacy in parenting," two-way analysis of variance will be utilized in order to determine interaction effects for the Bem classifications and parental perceptions of efficacy. Each classification group, based on the Bem Sex Role Inventory, will be considered independent from the other groups as suggested by McCall (1980).

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter reports the analysis of the data. It includes the results of the two way analysis of variance as well as the results obtained utilizing a one way analysis of variance.

This procedure was chosen based on the type of variables being utilized in the study, as well as a desire to utilize the more powerful parimetrics procedure as opposed to less powerful crosstabs. Due to the fact that the dependent variable of perceived efficacy is an ordinal variable and the independent variables of sex role orientation and gender are nominal it is appropriate to utilize analysis of variance as opposed to other statistical procedures.

TWO WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

A two way analysis of variance was used to test the significance of gender and sex role orientations upon the total scores of the perceived parenting efficacy scale. The mean efficacy scores for males and females were 10.49 and 10.59. The mean sex role orientation scores for masculine, feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated subjects were 10.44, 10.76, 10.77, and 9.95 respectively (Table 4).

The main effect comparing the perceived efficacy means with gender ($F=.106$, $df=1$, $p=.745$) was not significant (Table 5). The null hypothesis which predicted no significant difference between the mean scores of perceived efficacy and

gender could, therefore, not be rejected. This statistic indicates that gender is not significantly related to perceptions of efficacy in parenting.

The main effect comparing the mean scores of perceived efficacy with sex role orientation ($F=2.660$, $df=3$, $p=.051$) was significant (Table 5). Since the direct effect of sex role orientations was significant the null hypothesis predicting no significant difference between mean scores of perceived efficacy and sex role orientations could indeed be rejected.

Due to the significance indicated utilizing the two way analysis of variance the next statistical step was to carry out a one way analysis of variance in order to understand where the significance existed. A Scheffe was completed using the SPSSx program in order to test whether or not the groups were significantly different at the 0.0100 level. Utilizing the total scores as the dependent variable and the sex role orientation categories as the independent variables a significant difference was indicated between the undifferentiated subjects and the feminine subjects (Table 6).

TABLE FOUR

TWO WAY ANOVA MEANS AND CELLS SUMMARY TABLE

Sex Role Orientation	Mean Self Efficacy Scores		# of Individuals	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
Masculine	10.35	11.25	37	4
Feminine	10.86	10.74	7	35
Androgynous	10.85	10.72	13	18
Undifferentiated	10.27	9.64	11	11

TABLE FIVE

TWO WAY ANOVA SUMMARY TABLE

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Main effects	11.879	4	2.970	2.057	.090
SRO	11.519	3	3.840	2.660	.051
Gender	.154	1	.154	.106	.745
Interaction	5.181	3	1.727	1.196	.314

TABLE SIX

ONE WAY ANOVA (SCHEFFE)

Mean	Group	GRP 4	GRP 1	GRP 2	GRP 3
9.9545	Grp 4				
10.4390	Grp 1				
10.7619	Grp 2	*			
10.7742	Grp 3				

(*) Denotes significant difference between means of sex role orientation categories.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

This study examined the relationship between perceived parenting effectiveness and sex role orientations. The inquiry was based upon a theory-testing model of traditional theory, androgyny theory and masculinity theory. The three theories differ with regard to how sex role orientation of individuals, and their gender should relate to perceived efficacy in parenting.

Traditional theorists would assume that sex typed individuals should rate highest in perceived efficacy, if they were gender congruent. Masculine theorists would suggest that those possessing strong masculine traits would rate as the most effective, whereas androgynous theorists would predict the androgynous individuals to rate highest. None of the three theories were supported in their entirety by the findings of this study.

The study proceeded in three steps. Step one tested for questions sharing a common construct in order to create a scale of perceived parental efficacy. This step revealed three questions that loaded above .05 and the subsequent statistical procedures utilized the scale created from these three questions. The internal consistency of these items was assessed utilizing Cronbach's coefficient alpha and the

concurrent validity was assessed utilizing Pearson Product Moment Correlations.

The second step utilized a two way ANOVA which tested for a possible relationship between the mean scores of perceived efficacy and sex role orientation and gender. No direct effect was found with regards to gender but a direct effect was indicated for the sex role orientation variable. The third and final step was adopted in order to reveal where the significant differences existed with regards to the variable of sex role orientation. This step utilized a one way analysis of variance. This analysis revealed that a significant difference existed between the feminine category and the undifferentiated category. Therefore indicating that perceived efficacy in parenting is only significantly greater for those who are of the feminine orientation as opposed to those of the undifferentiated category.

The following discussion will deal with the findings and how they relate to the three research questions and the theories mentioned. As well, the limitations of this study and the implications for further research will also be discussed.

Answers to Research Questions

The research questions for this study were:

1. Is perceived efficacy in parenting related to the sex role orientation of the individual parent?

The answer to this question was confirmed, with regards to the significant finding of the two way Anova. There was a significant difference between the feminine sex role orientation and the undifferentiated sex role orientation. The findings however must be qualified. That meaning that a significant difference only exist between certain sex role orientations. The one way analysis of variance was carried out in order to clarify where the significant difference was with regards to sex role orientation. The statistical procedure confirmed that feminine subjects rate themselves significantly better in perceptions of parenting than do the undifferentiated subjects. What was not significant was the differences in perception ratings between any of the other sex role orientations. This possibly could be due to the rather traditionally feminine role study, as well as the differences in the cell sizes for each category.

This finding does support one of the reasons for examining perceptions. The author stated that perceptions were important and based this assumption on the work of other researchers. The first was a claim by Larson et al. (1973) in which he states that perception is an important dimension in individual and family reality and that it has been neglected in family theory and research to date. The study helps to rectify the neglect that has occurred in the past and the findings support that perception is indeed an important and significantly influential variable to consider.

Secondly, Safilios-Rothschild (1970) stated that perceived reality affects behaviors. Since perceptions are influential and therefore important the need to understand the link between perceptions and behaviors is obviously necessary. The third reason given for considering the variable of perception was that such a study could offer insight into behaviors that may prove advantageous for practitioners, as well as other professional dealing with families. This study's findings do offer some insight, that being the insight that we do not fully understand the link between perceptions and behaviors. We cannot since we have previously examined these variables in isolation of each other. This study states that perception plays a role in orientations and previous studies state that behaviors are influenced by orientations, the link is obvious. The concern is that one should not claim to fully understand the behavioral findings since perceptions are quite evidently influencing at least some of the orientations. This calls into question the models and the support that has been rallied for the assumptions put forth by them.

With regards to the theoretical hypotheses none were supported. This entitles one to question the appropriateness of supporting and advocating for any of the theories. The results from this study indicate that holes exist in all three theories. The only support was that all three theories would have predicated a relationship between perceptions of efficacy in parenting and the orientations. None of the hypotheses with

regards to the strength and the ordering of the relationships were supported.

Based on this finding it is important to examine perceptions of efficacy in relationship to behaviors. Examining this relationship may possibly clarify the discrepancies noted in past literature. These discrepancies may in part be related to the perceptional differences in the subjects. To simply examine the behavior differences negates the role of compounding variables that may be influencing the noted behaviors. The two way analysis of variance utilized in this study indicates that perceptions are indeed influencing at least some of the sex role orientations and therefore it is plausible that they are correlated with the behavioral differences noted by previous researchers (Baumrind, 1982; Bacon & Child, 1957; Ross, 1977).

2. Considering the implicit nature of gender within some of the models, how does gender relate to perceived efficacy in parenting?

This question was answered utilizing the two way analysis of variance technique. Analysis of the data revealed that gender was nonsignificant with regards to perceived efficacy in parenting. This finding disputes the traditional theorist' emphasis on the necessity for gender congruent traits and roles. Traditionalists state that gender is an important variable and that if one is to perceive oneself as effective

then one must undertake gender congruent roles as well as possess gender congruent traits. The significant finding of feminine subjects exceeding undifferentiated subjects in perceived efficacy ratings was not bound by those feminine subjects being of the female gender.

This finding is also interesting when one considers the significance given to gender in past research. Gender has played a dual role in that it has been coined essential by traditionalists (Baumrind, 1982) and completely overlooked by others (Ballenski & Cook, 1982; Hoch, 1987).

Further to this gender has been one of the variables for which contradictory results have been noted. Some findings indicate that gender is a significant variable in relation to sex role orientations (Baumrind, 1982; Bugen & Humerick, 1983) while others indicate that gender is not significant (Bem, 1974; Bem & Lenney, 1976; Rotundo, 1985). One has to wonder why the findings vary to such a great degree when gender is a variable that is easily identified and controlled. One could presume that compounding variables must be influencing the findings and thus responsible for the noted discrepancies.

This study addressed this possibility by examining the influence of perceptions on sex role orientation and gender. The result indicate that when considering both gender and orientation perceptions of efficacy are not influenced by the gender of the subject.

Although this does not totally clarify the discrepancies

noted in the literature it does address the necessity of researchers to examine numerous variables since different findings appear to result when combining different variables. Possibly gender plays a role in the behaviors of certain sex role orientations but not in perceptions of parenting efficacy. Future studies need to examine all the variables together in order to unravel the whole picture.

This lack of full understanding again supports this researcher's concern over advocating and implementing assumptions put forth by the theories. To date there exists too many discrepancies, as noted in the findings presented. These discrepancies indicate that we do not fully understand all the variables that interrelate with sex role orientations and blanket assumptions may not appropriately fit all the possible variable combinations. Until such time as these discrepancies are cleared up or at least better understood advocating and implementing these theories in practice is both premature and possibly an injustice to those influenced by such unclear findings.

3. Which model of sex role orientation most accurately reflects the relationship between perceived parental efficacy, sex role orientation and gender?

The answer to this question was not significantly revealed by any of the statistical procedures utilized, as none of the models were completely supported. Despite this the

data resulting from the analysis of variance procedures does indicate that the findings are worthy of consideration in terms of the assumptions put forth by proponents of the theories since some assumptions were supported and some unsupported by the analysis of the data. The initial two way analysis of variance indicated that gender was not significantly related to ratings of perceived efficacy in parenting. This finding alone disputes a major assumption indicated by traditional theorists. Traditional theory assumes that in order to be competent clear gender distinctions should be maintained. These theorists argue that due to biological predisposition and reinforced appropriate socialization, men and women are competent in different areas, and they argue for keeping the roles distinct rather than muting them (Baumrind, 1982). This study addressed the gender congruency issue with regards to perceived efficacy in parenting and found that gender was not an influencing variable.

Further to this the analysis of variance indicated that all three theories were correct in indicating that sex role orientation would be related to perceived efficacy. The data revealed that certain sex role orientations are significantly related to ratings of perceived efficacy in parenting, those being the feminine orientation in relation to the undifferentiated. One could argue, based on these findings, that the distinction lies only in those subjects who are undifferentiated as opposed to feminine. This finding calls

into question the adamant nature with which the different theorists' argue about the distinctions and superiorities of certain orientations over others.

The analysis also revealed the inaccuracy with regards to the masculine model. Proponents of this model dispute the need for feminine traits, stating that optimal functioning in both sexes is primarily due to the masculine trait (Whitley, 1985). This study's findings revealed that a significant difference existed between feminine subjects and the undifferentiated ones. This indicates that no significant difference was found between those subjects who rated as feminine as opposed to masculine. Such a difference would be necessary if indeed one was to be able to fully support the masculine model. Furthermore, the mean scores of the masculine subjects were considerably lower than those of the feminine or the androgynous subjects indicating that those of the masculine orientation actually rate themselves lower in perceptions of parental efficacy than those of the feminine or androgynous orientation.

The androgyny model was not supported by this study. Despite this the data revealed some interesting findings. The cell means acquired utilizing analysis of variance revealed that mean for the androgynous subjects exceeded the means for the other three categories, indicating that the androgynous subjects actually rated their parenting effectiveness higher then the other subjects in the study. The data also revealed

that a relatively low number of subjects were categorized as androgynous, in comparison to the masculine and feminine categories. Had the sample been larger the findings might have been different.

The findings of this study appear to call into question the validity of all three models, since none of the models were given total support. Although there was not strong support any model in particular this does not necessarily mean that sex role orientation is not an important trait to consider in future research, for previous studies indicate that it is. The present study indicates that a logical linkage does exist between sex role orientations and perceptions of parental efficacy. Based on this finding one could argue that linkages between sex role orientations and other variables need to be considered. This consideration should be carried out before continuing any further advocacy for theories that we do not fully understand.

The possibility strongly exists that the limitations of this study may be responsible for the lack of significant findings. These limitations need to be addressed in order that these findings may be taken within context, and future research may benefit by eliminating these limitations.

Limitations

The most obviously apparent limitation is the sample size. The sample utilized was small and relatively homogeneous, limiting the cell size. This limitation has been

most noted with regards to the androgynous groups mean not reaching the level of significance despite it's higher rating overall. This indicates that the ability to generalize from the study is questionable at best for the lack of significant findings may well be due to the limited sample size.

Another limiting factor is the sample not being randomly selected. This limitation enables one to generalize only to similar populations. Single-parent families, lower-income families, families with physically or mentally ill children, as well as non-Canadian families may have different responses. The volunteer nature of the sample may also have contributed to some families being self-selected out of the study therefore contaminating the study with those subjects who were willing to be interviewed. Possibly those subjects who, for one reason or another, declined from taking part in the study may have presented quite a different perspective.

A third limitation is the traditionally viewed role that was investigated in this study. Parenting to many is still primarily viewed as a female role and therefore may have some effect on the responses of some of the subjects in this or any other sample. Therefore it is important to consider that the role being investigated may be an important variable to consider. Subsequently, it is important to generalize these findings only to the role of perceptions of parenting and not perceptions overall or any other roles.

Another obvious limitation results from the secondary

analysis utilized in this study. Secondary analysis limits the data available to be examined and may result in difficulties with regards to study replication.

The findings are also limited by the correlational nature of the analysis, therefore, no cause-and-effect relationship in the results can be assumed.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following suggestions are offered for consideration in future research.

1. Study replication. Since this study was a secondary analysis, the researcher was limited in terms of the sample and the questionnaire. It is suggested that a larger random sample be utilized as well as a questionnaire directed towards sampling factors measuring perceived efficacy in parenting.

2. Longitudinal study. This research was carried out on two-children, intact families utilizing the responses based on the experiences recollected after the first child. Researchers, such as McBroom (1984), have found that sex role orientation may change with the changing stages of family development. Such a finding indicates the necessity to examine parenting perceptions over a longer time frame, such as from early pregnancy to the empty-nest stages in family development.

3. Instrument comparison. Due to the limited information

that can be acquired utilizing forced categorization of subjects multiple instrument comparison is recommended in future studies. Such a study could utilize the Bem inventory as well as other inventories designed to measure masculine and feminine traits without categorizing subjects, in order to give more insight into the role of one's orientation and the degree of influence that certain traits may have in differing degrees. Such a study may also provide further insight into how measurement techniques may have affected the findings to date.

4. Role comparison study. As the present study was concerned with a traditionally viewed female role, it would be beneficial to conduct a study which assesses the relationship of perceived efficacy in a number of different roles, ranging from roles perceived as very masculine to roles perceived as very feminine, as well as neutral roles. This may allow one to better understand not only how sex role orientation and gender are related to efficacy perceptions, but more specifically how they are also related to perceptions of efficacy in differing roles.

5. Perception and actual behaviors study. The present study dealt only with the perceptions of efficacy and made no claims as to the role that gender and sex role orientation may play in actual parenting behaviors. It may be beneficial to examine

the relationship of perceived efficacy to actual efficacy with regard to sex role orientation and gender. Such an analysis may facilitate use of the findings by researchers, therapists, and family life practitioners to aid future parents and the family unit in successfully fulfilling the roles that they encounter.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, C.H. & Sherer, M. (1985). Sex role orientation and psychological adjustments: Implications for the masculine model. Sex Roles, 12, 1211-1218.

Adams, W.J. (1983). A study of Intact Two-Children Families (parental perspectives). Unpublished questionnaire.

Anderson, K.L. (1986). Androgyny, flexibility, and individualism. Journal of Personality Assessment, 50, 265-278.

Antill, J.K. & Cummingham, J.D. (1979). Self-esteem as a function of masculinity in both sexes. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 47, 783-785.

Bacon, B.H. & Child, I.L. (1957). A cross cultural survey of some sex differences in socialization. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55, 327-332.

Ballenski, C.B. & Cook, A.S. (1982). Mother's perceptions of their competence in managing selected parenting tasks. Family Relations Journal of Applied Family and Child Studies, 31, 489-494.

Bandura, A. (1977). Social Learning Theory. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Publishing Co.

Bandura, A. (1984). Recycling misconceptions of perceived self-efficacy. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 8, 231-255.

Bandura, A., Adams, N.E. & Beyer, J. (1977). Cognitive processes mediating behavioral change. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 125-139.

Bassoff, E.S. & Glass, G.V. (1982). The relationship between sex roles and mental health: A meta-analysis of twenty six studies. Counseling Psychologist, 10, 105-112.

Baumrind, D. (1982). Are androgynous individuals more effective persons and parents? Child Development, 53, 44-75.

Bem, S.L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S.L. (1975). Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 634-643.

Bem, S.L. (1977). Beyond androgyny: Some presumptuous prescriptions for a liberated sexual identity. In C. Carney & McMalton (Eds.), Exploring contemporary male and female roles: A facilitator's guide. (p.209-229). La Jolla, Ca.: University Associates.

Bem, S.L. (1978) The Bem Sex Role Inventory. Palo Alto, Ca: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Bem, S.L. & Lenney, E. (1976). Sex typing and the avoidance of cross-sex behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33, 48-53.

Benedek, T. (1956). Psychobiological aspects of mothering. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 26, 272-278.

Blos, P. (1962). On Adolescence: A psychoanalytic interpretation. New York: Free Press.

Broverman, I.K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F.E., Rosenkrantz, P.S. & Vogel, S.R. (1970). Sex role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34, 1-7.

Bugen, L.A. & Humenick, S.S. (1983). Instrumentality, expressiveness, and gender effects upon parent-infant interactions. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 4, 239-251.

Campbell, M., Steffen, J.J. & Langmeyer, D, (1981). Psychological androgyny and social competence. Psychological Reports, 18, 611-614.

Cate, R. & Sugawara, A.I. (1986). Sex role orientation and dimensions of self-esteem among middle adolescents. Sex Roles, 15, 145-158.

Colten, M.E. (1982). Attitudes, experiences, and self perceptions of heroin addicted mothers. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 77-92.

Cutrona, C.E. & Troutman, B.R. (1986). Social support, infant temperament, and parenting self efficacy: A mediational model of postpartum depression. Child Development, 57, 1507-1518.

Flaherty, J.F. & Dusek, J.B. (1980). An investigation of the relationship between psychological androgyny and components of self-concept. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 984-992.

Ganong, L.H. & Coleman, M.M. (1987). Sex, sex roles, and familial love. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 140, 45-52.

Gecas, V. & Schwalbe, M.L. (1986). Parental behavior and adolescent self-esteem. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 37-46.

Heilbrun, A.B., Jr. (1976). Measurement of masculine and feminine sex-role identities as independent dimensions. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44, 183-190.

Hergenhahn, B.R. (1982). An Introduction to Theories of Learning, (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Hoch, S.F. (1987). The child as a manifest content of a dream: Parents' changing views of their own parents. Smith College Studies in Social Work, 57, 116-133.

Jackson, L.A., Ialongo,N. & Stollak, G.E. (1986). Parental correlates of gender role: The relations between parents' masculinity, femininity, and child rearing behaviors and their children's gender roles. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4, 204-224.

Jaworowska, A. (1981). Parental behavior as perceived by parents and their children. Polish Psychological Bulletin, 12, 177-186.

Kagan, J. (1964). Acquisition and significance of sex-typing and sex-role identity. Review of Child Development Research. (Vol. 1). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kalin, R. & Lloyd, C.A. (1985). Sex role identity, sex role ideology and marital adjustment. International Journal of Women's Studies, 8, 32-39.

Kazak, A.E. & Linney, J.A. (1983). Stress, coping and life change in the single-parent family. American Journal of Community Psychology, 11, 207-220.

Kelly, J.A. & Worrell, J. (1977). New formulations of sex roles and androgyny: A critical review. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 45, 1101-1115.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: CBS College Publishing.

Klein, M. (1948). Contributions to Psycho-analysis. London: Hogarth.

Knaub, P.K., Eversoll, D.B. & Voss, J.H. (1983). Is parenthood a desirable adult role? An assessment of attitudes held by contemporary women. Sex Roles, 9, 355-362.

Laing, R.D. Phillipson, H. & Lee, A. R. (1966). Interpersonal Perception. New York: Springer Publishing Co.

Larson, L.E., Goltz, W., Howell, J. & Kuhn, K. (1973). The application of perception theory to family systems and subsystems. Unpublished paper.

Lobel, T.E. & Winch, G.L. (1986). Different defense mechanisms among men with different sex role orientations. Sex Roles, 15, 215-220.

Locke, E.A., Frederick, E., Lee, C. & Bobko, P. (1984). Effects of self efficacy, goals and task strategies on task performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 241-251.

Locksley, A. & Colten, M.E. (1979). Psychological androgyny: A case of mistaken identity? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1017-1031.

Long, V.O. (1986). Relationship of masculinity to self esteem and self acceptance in female professionals, college students, clients, and victims of domestic violence. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 54, 323-327.

McBroom, W.H. (1984). Changes in sex-role orientation: A five year longitudinal comparison. Sex Roles, 11, 583-592.

McCall, R.B. (1980). Fundamental Statistics for Psychology. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Murstein, B.I. & Willians, P.D. (1983). Sex roles and marriage adjustment. Small Group Behavior, 14,77-94.

Murstein, B.I. & Williams, P.D. (1985). Assortive matching for sex-role and marriage adjustments. Personality and Individual Differences, 6, 195-201.

Mussen, P.H. (1969). Early sex-role development. In D.A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research. Chicago: Rand.

Orlofsky, J.L. & O'Heron, C.A. (1987). Stereotypic and non-stereotypic sex role trait and behavior orientations:

Implications for personal adjustment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 1034-1042.

Parsons, T. (1951). The Social System. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Pyke, S.W. (1985). Androgyny: An integration. International Journal of Women's Studies, 8, 529-539.

Pyke, S.W. & Graham, J.M. (1983). Gender schema theory and androgyny: A critique and elaboration. International Journal of Women's Studies, 6, 3-17.

Richardson, L.W. (1981). The Dynamics of Gender (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Roberts, F.B. (1983). Infant behavior and transition to parenthood. Nursing Research, 32,213-217.

Rossi, A. (1977). A biosocial perspective on parenting. Daedalus, 106, 1-31.

Rotundo, E.A. (1985). American fatherhood: A historical perspective. American Behavioral Scientist, 29, 7-23.

Schinke, S.P., Barth, R.P., Gilchrist, L.D. & Maxwell, J.S. (1986). Adolescent mothers, stress and prevention. Journal of Human Stress, 12, 162-167.

Schunk, D.H. (1984). Self-efficacy perspectives on achievement behavior. Educational Psychologist, 19, 48-58.

Schwarz, K. & Robins, C.J. (1987). Psychological androgyny and ego development. Sex Roles, 16, 71-81.

Silvern, L.E. & Ryan. V.L. (1979). Self-rated adjustment and sex-typing in the Bem Sex-Role Inventory: Is masculinity of primary predictor of adjustment? Sex Roles, 5,739-763.

Spence, J.T. & Helmreich, R.L. (1979). Psychological androgyny and sex role flexibility: A test of two hypotheses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37,1631-1643.

SPSSx User's Guide. (1983). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tomlinson,P.S. (1987). Spousal differences in marital satisfaction during transition to parenthood. Nursing Research, 36,239-243.

Whitley, B.E. (1983). Sex role orientation and self-esteem: A critical meta-analytic review. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 765-778.

Whitley, B.E. (1985). Sex role orientation and psychological well-being: Two meta-analyses. Sex Roles, 12, 207-225.

Windle, M. (1986). Sex role orientation, cognitive flexibility, and life satisfaction among older adults. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 10, 263-273.

Wright, L.S., Matlock, K.S. & Matlock, D.T. (1985). Parents of handicapped children: Their self-rating, life satisfaction, and parental adequacy. Exceptional Child, 32, 37-40.

APPENDIX A

	Page
Letter of introduction	84
Introduction via telephone	85
Informed consent	86

FACULTY OF HOME ECONOMICS
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA • EDMONTON, CANADA • T6G 2M8
403 • 432-3824

Consent-K-1

DATE

Dear :

Your name has been selected as a family with two children. I am in the Department of Family Studies, University of Alberta, and have started a research project on two-children families.

Very little information is known about such families, although they now appear to be the most typical type. By offering your help in providing some information about the problems, solutions, and needs of two-children families, you will be advancing knowledge that may aid others who decide on having this size family.

You should know that even though you decide to be interviewed you may withdraw from this study at any time. However, if you wish to participate the information you provide will be treated confidentially and your personal identity will remain anonymous.

As a token of appreciation for your consenting to share information with us, a copy of the results will be mailed to you if you wish to receive this.

Within a few days I, or my assistant, Lorraine Telford, will be phoning you to learn if you and your spouse will participate in this very important study.

If there are any questions you may contact me at my office (432-5768) or at home (436-5006).

Sincerely,

Wesley J. Adams, Ph.D.
Professor of Family Studies

WJA/ka

A STUDY OF TWO-CHILDREN FAMILIES

By

WESLEY J. ADAMS

Introduction to Families Via Telephone for Sample Selection

Hello,

My name is _____, and I recently sent you a letter regarding a research project concerning two-children families. I'm wondering if you and your spouse would be interested in participating in this research.

If respondent is not interested in possible participation, simply thank them for their time.

If respondent is interested in participating, then indicate that selection is based on their responses to the following questions:

1. Have you ever participated in a research study before?

2. Have you been at your present address at least (1) month?

CIRCLE

No *3. You are not now in the process of moving?

Yes *4. You have just the two children?

Yes *5. Are both children from this marriage?

No *6. Has your oldest child entered first grade?

(6 mos.+)*7. How old is your second child?

*Criteria questions

From what you have said, it would appear that you (do), (don't) meet the criteria for this study.

If they don't meet criteria thank them for willingness to participate.

Since you meet the criteria for inclusion in this study, may we set up a time for the interview which is mutually convenient?

A STUDY OF TWO-CHILDREN FAMILIES

INFORMED CONSENT

This study is concerned with learning about what sorts of things you have had to do in order to rear two children. Also, it is concerned with how you rate this experience. Finally, the research focuses on what kinds of support you have had as parents. The entire interview may last about 90 minutes.

In signing this Consent Form, you will be acknowledging that you wish to participate in this study. However, you are free to discontinue this interview at any point along the way. The information that you provide will be held in strict confidence and your personal identity will remain anonymous. If you so desire, at the close of the interview, you may indicate that you would like a copy of the results mailed to you.

_____ _____

Signature Date

APPENDIX B

Page

Questionnaire: A Study of Intact Two-Children Families (Parental Perspectives) 88

A

STUDY

OF INTACT

TWO-CHILDREN FAMILIES
(PARENTAL PERSPECTIVES)

- 1983 -

Conducted

By

Wesley J. Adams*

*Department of Family Studies
Faculty of Home Economics
University of Alberta

CODE: _____ M/F

PARENTS WITH TWO CHILDREN

INTRODUCTION
(to be read aloud)

This study is being conducted to learn about two-children families. This information will be analyzed to discover what problems, solutions, and needs are unique to this type family. Your responses are very important to the success of this research. Information provided will be held in confidence and your individual identities will remain anonymous. Before we can continue I require a consent form signed by you.

Directions
(to be read aloud)

1. Each of you will be interviewed separately. Please do not communicate with each other until both of your interviews have been completed. Thank you.

2. This questionnaire will be read out loud by me as you follow the various items.

3. Filling out of the questionnaire will be done by the interviewer only.

4. Most questions can be quickly answered, although a few may require an "explain" response for more detail.

5. Your questionnaire will be returned to interviewer at close of interview.

6. Do you have any questions before we begin?

PARENTS WITH TWO CHILDREN

BACKGROUND	CODING CATEGORY	VARIABLE NAME	COLUMN
1. CODE: _____	ID #	CARD 1	1-3
2. SEX: 1. M ___ 2. F ___	1 2	Sex	4
3. DATE: _____	Year	Year	5-6
4. BIRTHDATE: _____	Age	Age	7-8
5. WHEN MARRIED? _____	Yrs. Mrd.	Yrs. Mrd.	9-10
6. Level of Completed Education?		Educ.	11
1. Graduate Professional Training	1		
2. Standard College/Univ. Grad.	2		
3. Partial College Training	3		
4. High School Graduate	4		
5. Partial High School (10-11th)	5		
6. Junior High School (7-9)	6		
7. Less Than Seven Yrs. of School	7		
8. Other Post High School Training, Specify, Assign #3	8		
7. What is (was) your occupation? * _____		Occup.	12
1. Higher Exec., Major Professional	1		
2. Business Mgrs., Proprietors Medium	2		
3. Admin. Pers., Small Bus., Minor Prof.	3		
4. Clerical, Sales, Little Bus.	4		
5. Skilled Manual Employees	5		
6. Machine Operators, Semi-Skilled	6		
7. Unskilled Employees	7		
8. Never Worked	8		
8. Continue on to Page 2, No. 9. *See Hollingshead for Job Classification		Clasf.	13
1. -17	1		
2. -27	2		
3. -43	3		
4. -60	4		
5. -77	5		

BACKGROUND (cont'd)	CODING CATEGORY	VARIABLE NAME	COLUMN
			Card 1
9. Rate your level of satisfaction with your job.		Jobsat	14
1 2 3 4 5 very dis- dis- indif- very satisfied satisfied ferent satisfied satisfied	1 2 3 4 5		
10. Are you currently employed?		Job Stat.	15
1. Full-time	1		
2. Part-time	2		
3. Layed off	3		
4. Maternity leave	4		
5. Other, Specify _____	5		
11. What is your present income?		Income	16
1. Less than $10,000	1		
2. Between $10,000 and $14,999	2		
3. Between $15,000 and $19,999	3		
4. Between $20,000 and $24,999	4		
5. Between $25,000 and $29,999	5		
6. Between $30,000 and $34,999	6		
7. Between $35,000 and $39,999	7		
8. Between $40,000 and $49,999	8		
9. $50,000 or more	9		
12. What is your religious preference?		Religion	17
1. Catholic	1		
2. Protestant	2		
3. Jewish	3		
4. Other, Specify _____	4		
13. How often do you attend church?		Chratten	18
1. Daily	1		
2. Several times per week	2		
3. Once per week	3		
4. Every two-three weeks	4		
5. Monthly	5		
6. Rarely	6		
7. Never	7		
14. What is your ethnic origin?		Ethnic	19
1. British 4. German	1 4		
2. Canadian 5. Ukrainian	2 5		
3. French 6. Other _____	3 6		

BACKGROUND (cont'd)	CODING CATEGORY	VARIABLE NAME	COLUMN
			Card 1
15. What is your current state of health?		Health	20
1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Good 4 Excellent	1 2 3 4		

FIRST CHILD EXPERIENCE

A. PRE-POST-NATAL STATS PPNAT	CODING CATEGORY	VARIABLE NAME	COLUMN
			Card 1
1. Birthdate of first child? _____	Chlage	Chlage	21
2. Sex of first child? 1M _____ 2F _____	1 2	PPNAT1	22
3. What was your sex preference? 1. M ___ 2. F ___ 3. No Preference ___	1 2 3	PPNAT2	23
4. Was your first baby planned? 1. Planned ___ 2. Unplanned ___	1 2	PPNAT3	24
5. Was your pregnancy for the first child normal (e.g. 9 months)? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___, Specify _____	1 2	PPNAT4	25
6. Was the birth experience basically normal? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___, Specify _____	1 2	PPNAT5	26
7. Was your first child free of any serious defects at birth? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___, Specify _____	1 2	PPNAT6	27
B. PARENTING PREPARATION PRNTP			
1. Have you attended parenting courses? (lectures, instruction, etc.) 1. Yes ___ Specify _____ 2. No ___	1 2	PRNTP1	28
2. Were there any parenting courses available? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___ 3. Uncertain ___	1 2 3	PRNTP2	29

B. PARENTING PREPARATION PRNTP (Cont'd)	CODING CATEGORY	VARIABLE NAME	COLUMN
			Card 1
3. What sources of information have you used in parenting your first child? N (Never); Se(Seldom); So (Sometimes); F (Frequently)	N Se So F		
1. Your parents	1 2 3 4	PRNTP3	30
2. Your relatives, Specify _____	1 2 3 4	PRNTP4	31
3. Your friends	1 2 3 4	PRNTP5	32
4. Books, magazines, Specify _____	1 2 3 4	PRNTP6	33
5. Health professionals, Specify _____	1 2 3 4	PRNTP7	34
6. Other, Specify _____	1 2 3 4	PRNTP8	35
4. Did you need to move to larger quarters in preparing for arrival of first child? 1. Yes ___ 2. NO ___	1 2	PRNTP9	36
C. PARENTING EXPERIENCE PE			
1. Rank those things which were difficult being a first time parent beginning with most (1) to least (6) difficult.	Rank Order		
1. Reduced freedom	_____	PEDIFF1	37
2. Lack experience	_____	PEDIFF2	38
3. Change life style	_____	PEDIFF3	39
4. Change marital relationship	_____	PEDIFF4	40
5. Coping with child's demand	_____	PEDIFF5	41
6. Lack of sleep/tiredness	_____	PEDIFF6	42
7. Other, Specify _____	_____	PEDIFF7	43
2. Rank those things which were enjoyable being a first time parent beginning with most (1) to least (5) enjoyable.	Rank Order		
1. Observing child's development	_____	PEENJ1	44
2. Fulfills dream of family	_____	PEENJ2	45
3. Idea of parenthood	_____	PEENJ3	46
4. Relationship with child	_____	PEENJ4	47
5. Gave purpose to marriage	_____	PEENJ5	48
6. Other, Specify _____	_____	PEENJ6	49

C. PARENTING EXPERIENCE PE (Cont'd)	CODING CATEGORY	VARIABLE NAME	COLUMN
			Card 1
3. Rank those things which were surprising being a first time parent beginning with most (1) to least (5) surprising.	Rank Order		
1. Naturalness being parent	_____	PESUR1	50
2. Individuality of child	_____	PESUR2	51
3. Speed of child's develpment	_____	PESUR3	52
4. Amount of demands	_____	PESUR4	53
5. Adjustment of parents to child	_____	PESUR5	54
6. Other, specify _____	_____		
4. Does this child remind you of anyone? (Characteristics)? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1 2	PEREMIN1	55
5. If Yes to No. 4, child reminds you of: 1. Your Mo 4. Spouses Mo 2. Your Fa 5. Spouses Fa 3. Your Self 6. Spouse 7. Other _____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	PEREMIN2	56
6. Is this a physical or personality similarity? 1. Physical ___ 2. Personality ___ 3. Both (1 & 2) ___	1 2 3	PEREMIN3	57
7. How close do you feel to this child? 1 Very Distant; 2 Distant; 3 Indifferent; 4 Close; 5 Very Close	1 2 3 4 5	PEREMIN4	58
8. Rate your effectiveness as a parent with your first child. 1 Very Poor; 2 Poor; 3 Fair; 4 Good; 5 Very Good	1 2 3 4 5	PEFIRST	59
9. How would you describe your family with the first child? 1 Close; 2 Too Close; 3 Distant; 4 Too Distant; 5 Other Specify	1 2 3 4 5	PEFLY	60

	CODING CATEGORY	VARIABLE NAME	COLUMN
D. CHILD CARE CHICAR			Card 1
1. Did your parents help with the care of your first child? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___ 3. Unavailable ___	1 2 3	CHICAR1	61
2. If yes, did you ask for help? 1. Yes ___ 2. No. ___ 3. Other ___	1 2 3	CHICAR2	62
3. If no, did you ask for help? 1. Yes ___ 2. No. ___ 3. Other ___	1 2 3	CHICAR3	63
4. If unavailable, did you want their help? 1. Yes ___ 2. No. ___ 3. Other ___	1 2 3	CHICAR4	64
5. How would you describe your husband's/ wife's participation in child care responsibilities up until birth of second child?		CHICAR5	65
1. S(He) did not help care for child	1		
2. S(He) did 10-20%; I did 80-90%	2		
3. S(He) did 30-40%; I did 60-70%	3		
4. We share responsibility 50/50	4		
5. S(He) did 60-70%; I did 30-40%	5		
6. S(He) did 80-90%; I did 10-20%	6		
6. What community resources did you use in your first child care responsibilities? N (Never); Se(Seldom); So (Sometimes); F (Frequently)	N Se So F		
1. Baby Sitters	1 2 3 4	CHICAR6	66
2. Friends	1 2 3 4	CHICAR7	67
3. Neighbors	1 2 3 4	CHICAR8	68
4. Relatives (not parents)	1 2 3 4	CHICAR9	69
5. Day Care	1 2 3 4	CHICAR10	70
6. Play School (Nursery)	1 2 3 4	CHICAR11	71
7. Other, specify _____	1 2 3 4	CHICAR12	72
E. CAREER IMPACT CAREER			
1. How did one child affect your career?		CAREER	73
1. I don't have a career.	1		
2. It didn't interfere.	2		
3. It did interfere.	3		

	CODING CATEGORY	VARIABLE NAME	COLUMN
			Card 1
F. MARITAL SEX MARSEX			
1. How would you rate your sex life before your first child? 1 Very Poor 2 Poor 3 Fair 4 Good 5 Very Good	1 2 3 4 5	MARSEX1	74
2. How would you rate your sex life during your pregnancy of your first child? 1 Very Poor 2 Poor 3 Fair 4 Good 5 Very Good	1 2 3 4 5	MARSEX2	75
3. How would you rate your sex life after arrival of your first child? 1 Very Poor 2 Poor 3 Fair 4 Good 5 Very Good	1 2 3 4 5	MARSEX3	76
G. MARITAL HAPPINESS MARHAP			
1. Rate your marital happiness prior to the pregnancy of first child. 1 Very Low 2 Low 3 Average 4 High 5 Very High	1 2 3 4 5	MARHAP1	77
2. Rate your marital happiness during pregnancy of first child. 1 Very Low 2 Low 3 Average 4 High 5 Very High	1 2 3 4 5	MARHAP2	78
3. Rate your marital happiness after birth of first child and before pregnancy with second child. 1 Very Low 2 Low 3 Average 4 High 5 Very High	1 2 3 4 5	MARHAP3	79

H. PARENTING ISSUES PTISSUE	CODING CATEGORY	VARIABLE NAME	COLUMN
			Card 1
1. Do you feel that you were prepared enough for the parenting experience with the first child? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1 2	PTISSU1	80
			Card 2
2. Were your parents better prepared for their first parenting experience as compared to you? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___ 3. Uncertain ___	1 2 3	PTISSU2	1
3. Should first time parents be expected to take parenting courses? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___ 3. Uncertain ___	1 2 3	PTISSU3	2
4. Does the parenting experience mature one more quickly? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___ 3. Uncertain ___	1 2 3	PTISSU4	3
5. Does the parenting experience bring one closer to one's own parents? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___ 3. Uncertain ___	1 2 3	PTISSU5	4
6. Does first time parenting experience create closeness/distance to one's own spouse? 1 Very Distant 2 Distant 3 No Change 4 Close 5 Very Close	1 2 3 4 5	PTISSU6	5

SECOND CHILD EXPERIENCE

A. PRE-POST-NATAL STATS SECHILD	CODING CATEGORY	VARIABLE NAME	COLUMN
1. CODE: _____	ID #	CARD 2	6-8
2. SEX: 3M _____ 4F _____	3 4	Sex	9
3. Birthdate of second child? _____	Agesec	Agesec	10
4. Sex of second child? 1M _____ 2F _____	1 2	SECHILD1	11
5. What was your sex preference? 1. M ___ 2. F ___ 3. No Preference ___	1 2 3	SECHILD2	12
6. What would your sex preference be if you were to have a third child? 1. M ___ 2. F ___ 3. No Preference ___	1 2 3	SECHILD3	13
7. When did you decide to have a second child?		SECHILD4	14
1. Before I had any children.	1		
2. After I had first child.	2		
3. It was unplanned.	3		
8. What is the approximate age difference between your first and second child?		SECHILD5	15
1. One year	1		
2. Two years	2		
3. Three years	3		
4. Four years	4		
5. Other, specify _____	5		
9. Was your second pregnancy basically normal? 1. Yes ___ 2. No. ___, Specify _____	1 2	SECHILD6	16
10. Was the birth experience, as compared with the first child:		SECHILD7	17
1. Same	1		
2. More difficult	2		
3. Less difficult	3		
11. Was your second child free of any serious defects? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___, Specify _____	1 2	SECHILD8	18

B. PARENTING PREP SECOND CHILD PTSECH	CODING CATEGORY	VARIABLE NAME	COLUMN
1. Did you attend parenting courses (lectures, instruction, etc.) after birth of second child? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___ If No, go to no's. 2 & 3 If Yes, go to no. 3	1 2	PTSECH1	19
2. Were there any parenting courses available? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___ 3. Uncertain ___	1 2 3	PTSECH2	20
3. Do you feel that there is a need for second-child parenting courses? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___ 3. Uncertain ___	1 2 3	PTSECH3	21
4. Are home managing skills, in a two children family, as compared to a one child family: 1. More important 2. Less important 3. Equally important	1 2 3	PTSECH4	22
5. Parenting is different for each child. 1. True ____ 2. False ____	1 2	PTSECH5	23
6. You now have: 1. Two boys 3. Oldest boy-girl 2. Two girls 4. Oldest girl-boy	1 2 3 4	PTSECH6	24
7. Are the sources of information used in parenting your second child the same as those used with your first child? (see p. 4) 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___, Specify _____	1 2	PTSECH7	25
8. In a boy-girl family do you have a preference as to who should be oldest? 1. Boy ___ 2. Girl ___ 3. No Preference	1 2 3	PTSECH8	26
C. PARENTING EXPERIENCE SCNDIFF			
1. Rank those things where were difficult being a second time parent beginning with most (1) to least (9) difficult. 1. First child's reactions to second one 2. Time needed for two children	Rank Order _____ _____	 SCNDIFF1 SCNDIFF2	 27 28

C. PARENTING EXPERIENCE SCNDIFF (Cont'd)	CODING CATEGORY	VARIABLE NAME	COLUMN
			Card 2
3. Stress of parenting	_____	SCNDIFF3	29
4. Discipline problems	_____	SCNDIFF4	30
5. Sibling rivalry	_____	SCNDIFF5	31
6. Other, specify _____	_____	SCNDIFF6	32
2. Rank those things which were enjoyable being a second time parent beginning with most (1) to least (5) enjoyable.	Rank Order		
1. Watching interaction of children	_____	SCNENJ1	33
2. Greater parenting confidence	_____	SCNENJ2	34
3. More fulfillment	_____	SCNENJ3	35
4. Less up-tight with No.2 child	_____	SCNENJ4	36
5. Personality differences	_____	SCNENJ5	37
6. Other, specify _____	_____		
3. Rank those things which were surprising being a second time parent beginning with most (1) to least (4) surprising.	Rank Order		
1. Able to love both	_____	SCNSUR1	38
2. Both require much time	_____	SCNSUR2	39
3. Oldest child teaches youngest	_____	SCNSUR3	40
4. How different each child is	_____	SCNSUR4	41
5. Other, specify _____	_____		
4. Rate your effectiveness as a parent with your second child. 1 Very Poor 2 Poor 3 Fair 4 Good 5 Very Good	1 2 3 4 5	SECRATE	42
5. How would you describe your family with the second child? 1 Close 2 Too Close 3 Distant 4 Too Distant 5 Other Specify	1 2 3 4 5	YOURFLY	43
6. Who does this child remind you of? 1. MO 2. FA 3. SELF 4. SPOUSE'S MO 5. SPOUSE'S FA 6. SPOUSE 7. OTHER_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	REMIND	44
7. What is similarity based on? 1. PHY.___ 2. PERSONALITY___ 3. BOTH (1 & 2)___	1 2 3	SIMTY	45
D. CHILD CARE CC			
1. Did your parents help with the care of your second child? 1. Yes__ 2. No__ 3. Unav.__	1 2 3	CCPTS1	46
2. If yes, did you ask for help? 1. Yes__ 2. No__ 3. Other___	1 2 3	CCPTS2	47

D. CHILD CARE CC (Cont'd)	CODING CATEGORY	VARIABLE NAME	COLUMN
			Card 2
3. If No, did you ask for help? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___ 3. Other ___	1 2 3	CCPTS3	48
4. If Unavailable, did you want their help? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___ 3. Other ___	1 2 3	CCPTS4	49
5. With the second child how would you describe your husband's/wife's participation in child care responsibilities with that child?			
1. S(He) does not help.	1	CCSPOUS	50
2. S(He) does 10-20%; I do 80-90%.	2		
3. S(He) does 30-40%; I do 60-70%.	3		
4. We share responsibility 50/50.	4		
5. S(He) does 60-70%; I do 30-40%.	5		
6. S(He) does 80-90%; I do 10-20%.	6		
6. With a second child, how much time does your spouse spend with first child? 1. Less than before. 2. Same as before. 3. More than before.	1 2 3	CCONE	51
7. Are the community resources used with your second child care responsibilities the same as used with your first child? (see p. 6) 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___, Specify _____	1 2	CC1	52
E. CAREER IMPACT CARIMPCT			
1. How did second child affect your career?			
1. I don't have a career.	1	CARIMPCT	53
2. It didn't interfere.	2		
3. It did interfere.	3		
F. HOME MANAGEMENT HOMGMT			
1. Has having a second child created a need for more physical space? 1. Yes ___ 2. No. ___	1 2	HOMGMT1	54

F. HOME MANAGEMENT HOMGMT (Cont'd)	CODING CATEGORY	VARIABLE NAME	COLUMN
			Card 2
2. How much work is involved for two children compared to having one child (laundry, feeding, care)? 1. Two are as easy as one. 2. Only slightly more work. 3. Double the work. 4. More than double the work.	1 2 3 4	HOMGMT2	55
3. How much time do two children require compared to one? 1. Less time is required. 2. No difference in time. 3. More time is required. 4. Much more time is required.	1 2 3 4	HOMGMT3	56
4. Who, generally, manages finances in family? 1. Wife ___ 2. Husband ___ 3. Both ___	1 2 3	HOMGMT4	57
5. Who, generally, does grocery shopping? 1. Wife ___ 2. Husband ___ 3. Both ___ 4. Other ___	1 2 3 4	HOMGMT5	58
6. Who, generally, does the laundry? 1. Wife ___ 2. Husband ___ 3. Both ___ 4. Other ___	1 2 3 4	HOMGMT6	59
7. How often do you wish that you could return to being a one-child family? 1. Never 3. Sometimes 2. Seldom 4. Frequently	1 2 3 4	HOMGMT7	60
8. Do you sometimes feel that your family size is now complete? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___ 3. Uncertain ___	1 2 3	HOMGMT8	61
9. What in your opinion is a desireable size family? No. of Children 1 2 3 4 5 6 one two three four five more	1 2 3 4 5 6	HOMGMT9	62
G. PAST FAMILY PFLY			
1. How would you describe the family that you were reared in? 1. Close 2. Too close 3. Distant 4. Too distant 5. Other, Specify _____	1 2 3 4 5	PFLY1	63

G. PAST FAMILY PFLY (Cont'd)	CODING CATEGORY	VARIABLE NAME	COLUMN
			Card 2
2. Which parent were you closest to when growing up? 1. Mother 4. Both 2. Father 5. Deceased _____ 3. Neither	1 2 3 4 5	PFLY2	64
3. Which parent are you now closest to 1. Mother 4. Both 2. Father 5. Deceased _____ 3. Neither	1 2 3 4 5	PFLY3	65
4. How many siblings in your past family? 1. None ___ 2. Number (including self) 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, over 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	PFLY4	66
5. If you had one or more siblings were you? 1. Oldest ___ 3. Youngest ___ 2. Middle ___ 4. Other ___	1 2 3 4	PFLY5	67
6. How many brothers? 1. None ___ 5. Four ___ 2. One ___ 6. Five ___ 3. Two ___ 7. More (5) ___ 4. Three ___	1 2 3 4 5	PFLY6	68
7. How many sisters? 1. None ___ 5. Four ___ 2. One ___ 6. Five ___ 3. Two ___ 7. More (5) ___ 4. Three ___	1 2 3 4 5	PFLY7	69
8. Rate your present relationship with each parent. MOTHER 1 Very Poor 2 Poor 3 Fair 4 Good 5 Very Good	1 2 3 4 5	RATEMO	70
9. FATHER 1 Very Poor 2 Poor 3 Fair 4 Good 5 Very Good	1 2 3 4 5	RATEFA	71

	CODING CATEGORY	VARIABLE NAME	COLUMN
			Card 2
G. PAST FAMILY PFLY (Cont'd)			
10. Rate your present relationship with Parent in-laws. MOTHER 1 Very Poor 2 Poor 3 Fair 4 Good 5 Very Good	1 2 3 4 5	RATEMO	72
11. FATHER 1 Very Poor 2 Poor 3 Fair 4 Good 5 Very Good	1 2 3 4 5	RATEFA	73
H. MARITAL SEX MSFX			
1. How would you rate your sex life before second child? 1 Very Poor 2 Poor 3 Fair 4 Good 5 Very Good	1 2 3 4 5	MSEX1	74
2. How would you rate your sex life during your pregnancy with your second child? 1 Very Poor 2 Poor 3 Fair 4 Good 5 Very Good	1 2 3 4 5	MSEX2	75
3. How would you now rate your sex life? 1 Very Poor 2 Poor 3 Fair 4 Good 5 Very Good	1 2 3 4 5	MSEX3	76
I. MARITAL HAPPINESS MHAP			
1. Rate your marital happiness prior to your second child. 1 Very Low 2 Low 3 Average 4 High 5 Very High	1 2 3 4 5	MHAP1	77

I. MARITAL HAPPINESS MHAP (Cont'd)	CODING CATEGORY	VARIABLE NAME	COLUMN
			Card 2
2. Rate your marital happiness during your pregnancy with your second child. 1 Very Low 2 Low 3 Average 4 High 5 Very High	1 2 3 4 5	MHAP2	78
3. Rate your marital happiness since the birth of your second child (now). 1 Very Low 2 Low 3 Average 4 High 5 Very High	1 2 3 4 5	MHAP3	79
J. MARITAL COMMUNICATIONS - MCOMM			
1. How would you rate your communication with spouse? 1 Very Poor 2 Poor 3 Fair 4 Good 5 Very Good	1 2 3 4 5	MCOMM	80

APPENDIX C

Page

Tables for Sociological Variables 107

Table C-1

Ages of Parents

	Fathers			Mothers		
Age	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
21-24	1	1.4	1.4	3	4.3	4.3
25-28	7	10.0	11.4	14	20.0	4.3
29-32	32	45.7	57.1	36	51.4	75.7
33-36	22	31.5	88.6	13	18.6	94.3
37-40	5	7.2	95.8	4	5.7	100.0
41-43	3	4.2	100.0	0		
	N = 70			N = 70		

Table C-2

Years Married of Couples From Two-Child Families

Years Married	Frequency	Percent	Cum. Percent
3 - 5	6	8.6	8.6
6 - 8	32	45.7	54.3
9 - 11	22	31.4	85.7
12 - 14	7	10.0	95.7
15 - 17	3	4.3	100.0

N = 70

Table C-3

Education Levels of Parents

	Fathers			Mothers		
Education	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Grad. Training	8	11.4	11.4	2	2.9	2.9
Univ. grad	14	20	31.4	14	20	22.9
Partial/univ.	13	18.6	50.0	16	22.8	45.7
High sch. grad	24	34.3	84.3	31	44.3	90.0
Partia/high sch.	9	12.8	97.1	7	10.0	100.0
Junior high sch.	2	2.9	100.0	0		
	N=70			N=70		

Table C-4

Employment Status Of Parents

	Fathers			Mothers		
Employment	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Full time	66	94.3	94.3	10	14.3	14.3
Part time	1	1.4	95.7	25	35.7	50.0
Laid off	3	4.3	100.0	0		50.0
Maternity	0			0		50.0
Other	0			35	50.0	100.0
	N =70			N =70		

Table C-5

Socioeconomic Status Of Parents

	Fathers			Mothers		
Social Class	N	%	Cum. %	N	%	Cum. %
Upper	5	7.1	7.1	1	1.4	1.4
Upper-middle	12	17.1	24.3	15	21.4	22.9
Middle	20	28.6	52.9	27	38.6	61.4
Lower-middle	29	41.4	94.3	27	38.6	100.0
Lower	4	5.7	100.0	0		
	N=70			N=70		

Table C-6

Income Of Parents

	Fathers			Mothers		
Income	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
None	1	1.4	1.4	32	45.7	45.7
Less than $10000	2	2.9	4.3	22	31.4	77.1
$10000 - $14999	1	1.4	5.7	5	7.1	84.3
$15000 - $19999	5	7.1	12.9	2	2.9	87.1
$20000 - $24999	6	8.6	21.4	3	4.3	91.4
$25000 - $29999	12	17.1	38.6	3	4.3	95.7
$30000 - $34999	11	15.7	54.3	2	2.9	98.6
$35000 - $39999	12	17.1	71.4	1	1.4	100.0
$40000 - $49999	11	15.7	87.1	0		
$50000 or more	9	12.9	100.0	0		
	N=70			N=70		

Table C-7

Occupations of Parents

	Fathers			Mothers		
Occupation	N	%	Cum. %	N	%	Cum. %
Exec/major prof	5	7.1	7.1	1	1.4	1.4
Bus. Managers	12	17.1	24.3	16	22.9	24.3
Sm Bus/Min prof	10	14.3	38.6	24	34.3	58.6
Clerical/Sales	21	30.0	68.6	26	37.1	95.7
Skilled Manual	13	18.6	87.1	0		
Semi-skilled	9	12.9	100.0	3	4.3	100.0
	N=70			N=70		

Table C-8

Religion of Parents

	Fathers			Mothers		
Religion	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Catholic	22	31.4	31.4	24	34.3	34.3
Protestant	36	51.4	82.8	38	54.3	88.6
Jewish	2	2.9	85.7	2	2.9	91.5
Other	10	14.3	100.0	6	8.5	100.0
	N=70			N=70		

Table C-9

Church Attendance of Parents

	Fathers			Mothers		
Attendance	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Daily	0			0		
Sev. times/week	1	1.4	1.4	0		
Once/week	7	10.1	11.5	16	22.9	22.9
Every 2-3 weeks	6	8.7	20.2	9	12.9	35.7
Monthly	3	4.3	24.5	4	5.7	41.4
Rarely	39	56.5	81.0	33	47.1	88.6
Never	13	18.8	99.8	8	11.4	100.0
	N=69			N=70		